

# APPENDIX F

Probation Services Task Force  
Comment Charts for Draft Interim Report  
and  
Draft Final Report

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Andy Pickett Administrative Analyst	Sonoma County Administrator's Office		Blank	The relevancy of the comparison between appropriations for probation departments and prisons is not readily obvious to me.	Funding	Disagree. The task force believes that the comparison between probation and prisons is relevant to equitable resource allocation in the justice system.
Andy Pickett Administrative Analyst	Sonoma County Administrator's Office		Blank	I don't know how accurate it is to characterize offender fees as a "primary funding source." This revenue is quite limited and makes up a small percentage of total revenue, eclipsed by other grants and programs, such as JJCPA.	Funding	Disagree. Report does not characterize offender fees as a primary funding source.
Andy Pickett Administrative Analyst	Sonoma County Administrator's Office		Blank	Without further explanation, I question the conclusion that a caseload with more felonies automatically is characterized as "markedly more violent." Are there crimes classified and/or tried as felonies that were heretofore misdemeanors? Are there any nonviolent felonies?	Probationers	Agree. Will revise to better characterize probation population.
Bob Franklin Executive Director	State Coalition of Probation Organizations, SCOPO			Page 3 discusses the increase of felons on probation and the marked decrease of misdemeanants. In the early 1990s numerous departments closed their doors to the municipal courts. This action has continued after the consolidation of the courts and is now represented by a total refusal to offer services to misdemeanor cases. This has led directly to the reality of 70% of all probationers being felons. This decision was directly a result of budget restraints and the inability to meet local demands for service. The result relates to the question of whether probation should be offering prevention and intervention to those individuals most likely to gain from our involvement or are we to become an arm of law enforcement through intensive efforts with a population of felons with long-standing criminality? In many cases, our best efforts may be to provide surveillance and to return these individuals to incarceration at the earliest opportunity. This is not to say some may not finally gain insight and make positive change but the probability of this change lessens as criminality matures.	Services	Agree. Report will be revised to acknowledge reasons why more probationers are felons (e.g., probation use of informal/court).
John M. Wardell Chief Probation Officer	Nevada County Probation		Agree only if modified	The report addresses how the chief probation officer may be appointed and who they will be responsible to. I understand that at the local level counties fiscally support the probation department even though the courts appoint us, and this has been an area of contention. I have always understood that I have two bosses. I believe that the majority of my colleagues do as well. In my case, at the local level I have over the past four years seen a turnover of four new boards of supervisors to no new judges. My point is that politics seem to play less of a role for me being appointed by the judges. If there were a way for county CEO/CAOs to be versed, involved and vested in the operations of a probation department, as the judges are, there would be less resistance for chief probation officers being totally responsible to CEO/CAOs.	Governance	Phase II.
J. Steven Worthley Chairman	Tulare County Board of Supervisors	X	Blank	Regarding Principles 1 & 2: We agree with the spirit of the first principle linking authority, responsibility and funding; however, we believe the point should be made more directly. The term "connected" does not clearly convey the necessity of placing authority and responsibility with a single entity. Principle 2 calling for partnerships to administer probation departments would then be in conflict with the first principle. A single entity must be identified to be responsible for probation services. That entity would then be empowered to work collaboratively with the various components of the justice system and the community as a whole to ensure that services are delivered efficiently and effectively.	Principles	Phase II.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		The readers are unclear as to why Principle 2 rises to the level of a principle. It reads substantially differently from the other principles; the task force might consider removing it. Indeed, Principle 2 reads like a recommendation. The readers recommend that it be dropped.	Principles	Disagree. Fundamental principles were developed to guide the task force's process.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
J. Steven Worthley Chairman	Tulare County Board of Supervisors	X	Blank	Principle 5 is problematic in that the range of probation services is quite broad, and some services are similar to those provided by other arms of county government. To lock in to a single department concept could preclude future opportunities for innovative programming based on the capacities and needs of individual local jurisdictions. For purposes of future analysis by the task force, the single department concept could be used as a guideline, but we would not want to see it become an absolute requirement.	Principles	Disagree. The task force developed the five fundamental principles to serve as guiding principles for its work. This principle relates to the need for adult and juvenile probation to be connected and should not be interpreted as a recommendation for the integration of other services (e.g., substance mental health abuse).
Jose R. Villarreal Public Defender	Office of the Public Defender Santa Clara County			Add sixth fundamental principle: "The primary focus of probation departments/agencies at the local level should be to assist the probationer to remain compliant with the terms and conditions of the probation order."	Principles	Disagree. The five fundamental principles were developed by the task force to serve as guiding principles for its work. The suggestion is directed at probation activities and so could more appropriately be characterized as a recommendation.
Trish Clarke Chair	CSAC Administration of Justice Policy Committee	X		The development of five fundamental principles is, from the county perspective, one of the key accomplishments from the last 18 months. We are convinced that the use of these principles will serve as the appropriate basis for examining the current delivery of probation services and for evaluating various alternative probation system models. Of critical importance is that ongoing discussions and the development of any new governance models for probation continue to be guided by these five principles, especially the important recognition in Principle 1 that responsibility and liability must be connected to appointment and removal authority.	Principles	Phase II.
Andy Pickett Administrative Analyst	Sonoma County Administrator's Office		Blank	Principle 1 and Principle 2 can be read to be mutually exclusive, and therefore contradictory as guiding principles. If authority and responsibility are connected, how can you also develop partnership to administer the department?	Principles	Phase II.
J. Steven Worthley Chairman	Tulare County Board of Supervisors	X	Blank	We agree with the third and fourth principles as written.	Principles	No response necessary.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		On page 49, the task force refers to a minor as a defendant.	General	Agree. Wording will be revised.
Bob Franklin Executive Director	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)			Page 43 discusses the balance of services. This issue was the subject of both the Governor's Blue Ribbon Commission and the CPPCA presentation, Corrections 2000. Both called for balanced funding, balanced attention and continued review. Neither had the desired impact and the problems continue.	Services	No response necessary.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### Comment Chart

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Gerald L. Gleeson Public Defender	San Joaquin County Public Defenders Office		Agree only if modified	Revise recommendation 1 to read: Probation departments must have adequate funding to effectuate rehabilitation and reentry into the community. Rehabilitative efforts should ensure offender accountability.	Funding	Disagree.
Doug Rublaitus Chief Probation Officer	Alpine County Probation		Agree	More funding needs to be directed toward early intervention and prevention. This means more <u>real</u> , not superficial, collaboration between agencies is necessary.	Funding	Phase II.
Bob Franklin Executive Director	State Coalition of Probation Organizations, SCOPO			If less than 30% of a department's funding comes from local general funds we are forced to forever chase dollars over consideration of responding to actual needs.	Funding	No response necessary.
Bekki Riggan Principal Management Analyst	Placer County Executive Office		Agree	The experiences of Placer County mirror the issues highlighted in the draft <i>Probation Services Task Force Interim Report</i> . Clearly, current funding levels for probation services have not reflected the increases in correctional populations and the resulting increased demand on probation services. This is partly due to the current funding structure based on local government and the collection of offender fees. Although recent years have seen an infusion of state and federal grant funding opportunities, this patchwork method of funding complicates operational management and long-term planning efforts. Until an alternative funding structure is developed, probation will most likely be expected to reallocate existing resources—with limited increases in local contribution—to achieve their objectives.	Funding	No response necessary.
Kimberly Barrett Chief Probation Officer	San Luis Obispo Probation Dept.		Agree	Probation clearly needs stable funding.	Funding	No response necessary.
Andy Pickett Administrative Analyst	Sonoma County Administrator's Office		Blank	Pg. 6 It could be argued that the programs are exemplary BECAUSE of the fiscal and operational challenges, not despite them. These forces could have brought about a balance of funding and efficiency.	Funding	No response necessary.
Doris Foster Assistant Management Consultant	Stanislaus County - Chief Executive Office		Agree only if modified	Recommendation 1: Probation departments must have stable and adequate funding FROM THE STATE to protect the public and ensure offender accountability and rehabilitation.	Funding	Phase II.
Doris Foster Assistant Management Consultant	Stanislaus County - Chief Executive Office		Agree only if modified	The state should consider funding all probation programs.	Funding	Phase II.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Recommendation 1: Agree. The system of baseline funding with grant money to supplement for special projects should be preserved. However, the baseline must be adequate.	Funding	Phase II.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		There are financial implications of many of the recommendations. It may be more powerful to make that explicit, perhaps even writing a recommendation about the inextricable links between the proposed change in governance, other recommendations, and both the source of funding and the increased funding that will be necessary.	Funding	Phase II.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Stephen Birdleough	Friends Committee on Legislation of California		Blank	Consider refocusing the first recommendation to highlight the value of the services provided by effective probation supervision. Policy makers need to understand that expenditures for probation are designed to increase the number of satisfied victims, as well as the number of former offenders who become productive citizens.	Funding	Agree. Text explaining context of recommendation will be revised.
Stephanie J. Larsen Deputy County Administrator	County of San Joaquin		Blank	On Table 9 and in other places in the report, they refer to county funding as "base" funding, which to me implies that we are primarily responsible for funding probation services. I'd prefer wording of a "maintenance of effort" provision. I think the language should be similar to trial court funding's AB 233, where it was clearly stated that the primary funding responsibility was the state's, although counties would pitch in with a maintenance of effort payment.	Funding	Disagree. Currently the county is primarily responsible for funding probation. During phase II, explore the task force I alternative funding scenarios.
Wendy Watanabe Assistant Division Chief	Los Angeles County Chief Administrator's Office		Agree	Concur with the draft Probation Services Task Force's Interim Report recommendations with a primary focus on the appropriate need for a stable/increased funding stream which would enable enhanced planning for longer- term service delivery, as probation funding is too often a "patchwork" of support, based in many instances on grant funding.	Funding	No response necessary.
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	Recommendation 1: Under the current funding, the probation department must rely on grants and allocations to balance the budget. General funds are augmented with TANF, Title IV-E, CPA 2000 (AB 1913), and individual grants, such as the OCJP Juvenile Drug Court Enhanced Supervision Unit. While the courts indicate a lack of rehabilitative programs, the reality is that there is not sufficient funding to develop them locally.	Funding	Phase II.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	Recommendation 1: First, the work has to be defined, and how much it takes to accomplish the task. I have argued that probation should not be tied to the court any more than the DA or PD. The court is not involved with community prevention and does not want to be involved in detention facilities. Principles 2 and 3 say governance should be at the local level. This must be abandoned. For complete comments, see tab 41.	Funding	Phase II.
Mari Beraz County Administrative Officer	Monterey County Administrator's Office	X	Blank	Monterey County supports the fundamental concepts of recommendations 1 through 7. The county fully supports further review and strategy development in these areas to more specifically define methods, procedures, and needs, and to identify support mechanisms for achieving successful implementation of final recommendations by individual probation departments statewide. It should be noted that final recommendations must be flexible to local circumstances, needs and abilities, as determined by individual counties.	Funding	No response necessary.
Richmond, Harlan, Vinson, Krietich	Amador County Superior Court, Board of Supervisors, and Probation Department	X	Blank	Recently, Amador County Superior Court appointed a new chief probation officer. This was done in a completely collaborative manner between the court, the board of supervisors, the juvenile justice commission, and neighboring probation departments. Similar appointment of the chief probation officer by the superior court appears to be appropriate, but a synergistic approach similar to Amador County seems to be in the true spirit of balanced justice.	Governance	Phase II.
Bekki Riggan Principal Management Analyst	Placer County Executive Office		Agree	Regarding the CPO appointment, evaluation, and removal processes, Placer County is a charter county, and as such supports a collaborative decision-making process between court and county officials.	Governance	No response necessary.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Fred Agular Chairman	San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors	X	Blank	As is pointed out in the draft report, the fragmentation of the current probation governance structure leaves boards of supervisors with financial responsibility for probation services although we exercise no formal authority regarding management of this important function. Unlike the current relationship between boards of supervisors and sheriffs/district attorneys (where those independently elected officials are directly responsible to the electorate for effective service delivery), the current probation structure leaves supervisors publicly accountable for actions taken by CPOs who report to officials within a separate branch of government. To remedy this, we urge the task force to address this issue before release of this Interim Report. While there is much to be reviewed over the next 18 months, regarding the overall scope of probation services, the need to address governance issues has taken on greater urgency due to evolving county/court relationships being crafted in response to the trial court reform. Specifically, this board believes that accountability and authority regarding probation operations should reside within a single branch of government.	Governance	Phase II.
Sylvia J. Johnson Chief Probation Officer	Alameda County Probation Department		Agree	I regret the second study phase and was hopeful for resolution of the reporting authority for CPOs. This needs to be resolved as a step toward stable funding and professional views of the system and probation services.	Governance	Phase II.
J. Warchol Chief Probation Officer	El Dorado County Probation Department		Blank	I continue to believe that the chief probation officer should remain under the supervision of the court. The relationship established between courts and CPO reinforces the spirit of cooperation and collaboration. As a CPO, being appointed is the "best day on the job." Nobody ever thinks about being terminated. However, that is a reality. If there is a problem with the actual process, then that is what should be addressed. We should focus on being consistent on appointments, evaluation, and removal of a CPO, since that is the real problem. Being under the CAO or committee is a conflict. Under a CAO, a chief probation officer could be terminated for not meeting budget targets or for issues beyond their control. It could create distance between a CPO and the courts. This is not good for probation departments, clients, or the courts.	Governance	Phase II.
Doug Rublaitus Chief Probation Officer	Alpine County Probation		Agree	It is imperative that the judicial and county BOS take an equally active role in the selection and evaluation of the CPO.	Governance	Phase II.
Larry Parish County Executive Officer	County of Riverside, Executive Office	X	Blank	Riverside County supports alignment of the appointing authority of the CPO and the fiscal responsibility for probation services within a single branch of government.	Governance	Phase II.
Gail Steele Supervisor	Alameda County Board of Supervisors		Blank	The chief probation officer for Alameda County is exclusively accountable to one presiding juvenile judge who handles supervision, hiring and firing. This situation has absolutely not worked out. The judges do not administer their responsibilities regarding the CPO and are left without any accountability. I believe the CPO should be under the supervision of the board of supervisors. Alameda County currently hires the public defender and could do the same with the CPO. I truly believe that one judge should not have absolute power when it comes to administering programs of such importance.	Governance	Phase II.
Thomas Folena Editor in Chief	State Coalition of Probation Organization (SCOPO)		Agree only if modified	I am hopeful that in the future you will be able to establish guidelines for the recruitment and hiring of CPOs. This is an area of major concern with me.	Governance	Phase II.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
	San Luis Obispo County Probation	X	Agree	Because we write from San Luis Obispo County, we encourage some standardization in the chief probation officer selection and evaluation process. Our department has been through two lengthy investigations in 10 years that resulted in the termination of two separate chiefs, and several other investigations. We understand firsthand how important it is to have a chief that understands and accepts the dual roles of the probation officer, supports the officer safety issues and training, has the ability to effectively lobby for our needs on a local level, and will receive input from their experienced line staff the same way they would their managers.	Governance	Phase II.
Wendy Watanabe Assistant Division Chief	Los Angeles County Chief Administrator's Office		Agree	Concur with the draft Probation Services Task Force's Interim Report recommendations with a primary focus on governance issues, where local control is fundamental to developing probation services tailored to the distinct needs of the varied communities served. To this end, the appointment of chief probation officers by local leaders is constituent based, and thus, provides closer accountability than would generally be possible at the state level. Focus and consideration should be given to the unique characteristics and requirements of each county.	Governance	Phase II.
John M. Wardell Chief Probation Officer	Nevada County Probation Department		Agree only if modified	How do facilities fit into the committee's report? Will juvenile facilities remain under the probation department? If so, is there a conflict with the local bench. If they will not, it will be extremely difficult given facilities are so vital to the overall effect of probation services.	Governance	Phase II.
J. Warchol Chief Probation Officer	El Dorado County Probation Department		Blank	I believe that the supervision of juvenile halls should continue to be under the chief probation officer. To separate this connection would put distance between field supervision officers and the juvenile hall staff in terms of programs and services. Much like it stands in the adult world, adult field supervision probation officers have no input with the programs and services in jail. I fear that juvenile halls would turn into "mini-jails," and rehabilitation/treatment would not be a priority if taken from the supervision of the CPO.	Governance	Phase II.
Alice Vilardi Judge	Superior Court of California, County of Alameda		Agree only if modified	The last sentence of the 2nd paragraph could be clarified to identify what aspects of assuming facilities emerged as an obstacle: The assumption of financial responsibility to build and/or maintain? The assumption of legal liability for injuries or losses that occur in or around the facilities? The responsibility for managing, staffing, maintaining, and responding to liability for facilities?	Governance	Agree. Will revise for clarity.
Alice Vilardi Judge	Superior Court of California, County of Alameda		Agree only if modified	The draft uses the word "liability" in two senses on this page and in other contexts throughout the report. In some sentences, such as in the 2nd paragraph on p. 62, the term means "financial liability." In other contexts, such as in the 4th paragraph of this page, the term appears to mean "legal liability." Adding the modifiers throughout the document where the word liability occurs may be helpful to distinguish between obligations to provide and maintain, on the one hand, and the obligation to respond to lawsuits. The reference to "a court-funded insurance policy" in the 4th may confuse who has legal liability to pay any judgment or settlement filed with how it [they?] finance the legal liability. Because there are so many ways to fund legal liability other than insurance, the clause should be deleted.	Governance	Agree. Will revise for clarity.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	Recommendation 2: I have given my critique of the principles and believe they disagree with the spirit of the charge. Principles 2 and 3 restrict open-minded thinking on the organization/funding issues. Regarding the mission statement, I contend you cannot have 59. Otherwise, you can have 59 different organizations. For complete comments, see tab 41.	Governance	Phase II.
Gerald L. Gleeson Public Defender	San Joaquin County Public Defenders Office		Agree only if modified	Omit recommendation 2.	Governance	Disagree. Development of a governance model is necessary for the task force to fulfill its charge.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
C. Brent Wallace County Administrator	County of Tuolumne Administrator's Office		Agree only if modified	The issue of accountability for the work product of the probation department, more specifically, the chief probation officer, remains open. It appears that Rec. 2 is designed to develop an eventual answer as to whom the probation chief/department will be accountable to, but I read nothing in the report as to a recommendation resolving this issue. In fact, the language appears to be vague. It is recognized that each county has a different model in place as to governance, accountability and structure and that it is virtually impossible to develop a single model that will fit each county. However, the current system of divided responsibility between the court, the board of supervisors and, in some cases, a county administrator is unacceptable. There may need to be multiple models developed, such as those that are available for the provision of Mental Health Services, but the report should come to some conclusions as to recommending models that may be implemented to resolve the accountability concerns.	Governance	Phase II.
Bob Franklin Executive Director	State Coalition of Probation Organization, (SCOPO)			FUTURE OF PROBATION: the task force did a great job in evaluating the variations of governance. One concern is to guard against any governance placing undue pressure on probation to support law enforcement, prosecution or relief from overcrowding in jails and institutions at the expense of other services. These include the ability of probation to take independent and at times opposing positions especially in areas of investigation, recommendations and needs assessments.	Governance	Phase II.
Trish Clarke Chair	CSAC Administration of Justice Policy Committee	X		We remain concerned, however, that several fundamental issues in need of resolution remain under consideration — especially in the areas of governance, financing, and core services. In the second phase of the task force, we will be endeavoring to complete the development of a probation model that, among other things, adheres to the principle that responsibility and authority must be connected. In the meantime, county representatives will continue to advocate interim steps to address existing concerns in counties with respect to governance and appointment issues. In our view, the governance issue must be resolved before we can move forward on the other issues identified in Section VI that outlines future steps.	Governance	Phase II.
Kimberly Barrett Chief Probation Officer	San Luis Obispo Probation Dept.		Agree	Probation clearly needs to remain a local executive and judiciary agency.	Governance	Phase II.
Doris Foster Assistant Management Consultant	Stanislaus County - Chief Executive Office		Agree only if modified	The chief probation officer should be appointed by the board of supervisors if program funding is going to continue to be primarily at the local level.	Governance	Phase II.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Recommendation 2: Agree. The treatment of the problem and the recommendation itself are well done and "hit the nail on the head." The task force was wise to state that they need time and further study on the governance matter.	Governance	Phase II.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		There are interesting issues regarding centralization and governance, beyond the fact that Recommendation 2 must be addressed before Recommendation 9 can be considered. An issue that would arise as this recommendation is implemented is: Would we have a system that allows localities to identify cases for prevention and early intervention that are based in local standards? (E.g., courts may differ in how they view misdemeanor drug possession and those differences may be grounded in legitimate views about the link—in those communities—between that offense, on the one hand, and harm and risk, on the other.)	Governance	Phase II.
Bart Bohn County Administrative Officer	Fresno County		Blank	I will continue to closely monitor the progress of the report and continue to support your efforts to solidify and embrace the importance of your work on this most important topic. I am particularly interested in your governance review and recommendation of the selection and appointment of the chief probation officer position. Again, congratulations on an excellent Interim Report and best wishes on your continued effort.	Governance	No response necessary.
Fred Aguilar Chairman	San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors	X	Blank	In response to the AOC's call for comments regarding the draft Probation Services Task Force Interim Report, the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors submits this letter to encourage the task force to fully explore options which unify authority and responsibility for probation management.	Governance	Phase II.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
James Rowland Chief Probation Officer	Napa County Probation Department	X	Agree	In regard to the overall concept of developing a statewide probation model, we see considerable promise, especially in view of the incisiveness of these recommendations. There is great potential benefit in establishing working definitions of ourselves and our work, especially vis-à-vis the related agencies with whom we collaborate. Our reservation would be related to how this might affect individual counties' ability to creatively address their specific local issues. We see that this concern has been considered, and look forward to further elucidation.	Governance	Phase II.
Stephen Birdlebough	Friends Committee on Legislation of California		Blank	In recommendation 2, avoid any implications that further study will delay immediate progress. The core issues affecting probation services lie in the quality of the relationships that develop between the providers and the clients (both victims and offenders). Therefore, management training, constant feedback from the clients, and constant efforts to facilitate the things that work best are at the core of success. This requires a self-monitoring system that is in constant change as it responds to unexpected demands of the client base. The task force could move quickly to create a high-quality, low-cost, cutting-edge management training and research regime similar to CJER. The most robust probation models will emerge from the voluntary application of best practices by informed professionals. The task force (and its successors) can then describe the models that emerge as a means of educating the Legislature and others.	Governance	Phase II.
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	I believe that the chief probation officer should be appointed and evaluated by the board of supervisors, with input from the courts regarding the judicial duties of the CPO as one of his functions.	Governance	Phase II.
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	Recommendation 2: I concur that further study is needed to develop this model. Until these three issues are resolved, there will not be a uniform method of applying services. In my opinion, it comes down to "the who is holding the purse strings gets to call the dance." Programs can be mandated, but without adequate funding, not implemented. Therefore, either the courts and state should fund and have authority over the probation officer, or the county should be responsible for funding and the appointment and evaluation of the CPO.	Governance	Phase II.
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	I believe the courts have no interest in the administration or financial issues of the department, but wish to retain full authority over the appointment of the CPO. I believe the Judicial Council, as a whole, in this county does not understand the administrative functions of the CPO, such as budget preparation and maintenance, grant and funding procurement, personnel and disciplinary issues, and the general duties of a chief executive officer. They see the probation officer as an arm of the court, who will provide needed services in a timely and efficient manner, regardless of budgetary or personnel constraints. Although the county administrative office is supportive and helpful in the budget arena, and perhaps sympathetic about the demands made by the courts on the probation officer, its concern is more financial than program oriented. The CAO sees the everyday operations of the department and best understands the executive duties needed to provide the end services.	Governance	
Penelope Clarke Administrator	County of Sacramento Public Protection Agency	X	Blank	California Probation Model: Recommendation 2 suggests further study into the development of a model that conforms to the tasks force's fundamental principles and addresses the governance, structural, and fiscal concerns facing local probation departments. Generally, Sacramento County is interested in maintaining an integrated justice system with no new mandates to restrict the ability to fund departments appropriately and within local financing capabilities. The past few organizational changes initiated by the state (trial court funding and child support services) have had both positive and negative impacts on the system.	Governance	Phase II.
Penelope Clarke Administrator	County of Sacramento Public Protection Agency	X	Blank	The court model appears to be the least attractive choice because probation services are such an integral part of county functions.	Governance	Phase II.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Penelope Clarke Administrator	County of Sacramento Public Protection Agency	X	Blank	The local executive model is the preferred model at this time. Sacramento County's Probation Department is structurally linked to many county departments and particularly to the integrated justice system. The local executive model maintains the current structure and provides the flexibility and authority to determine program levels within available financing.	Governance	Phase II.
Penelope Clarke Administrator	County of Sacramento Public Protection Agency	X	Blank	The state model appears to be similar to the child support services model. The county has had a positive experience developing this model, making it an acceptable alternative. The structure allows for state regulations accompanied with state financing while allowing the department to maintain its integrated county functions. If this were chosen as the California Probation Model it would be important to include all current operating costs when establishing the MOE and all future costs should be state financed.	Governance	Phase II.
Mari Beraz County Administrative Officer	Monterey County Administrator's Office	X	Blank	Monterey County supports the fundamental concepts of recommendations 1 through 7. The county fully supports further review and strategy development in these areas to more specifically define methods, procedures, and needs, and to identify support mechanisms for achieving successful implementation of final recommendations by individual probation departments statewide. It should be noted that final recommendations must be flexible to local circumstances, needs and abilities, as determined by individual counties.	Governance	Phase II.
Dario L. Marengo Board Member	San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors			The concern in our county about the probation department is that it actually has been placed in a difficult position by the state. The probation department in San Joaquin County works under the direction of the courts, but it is not funded by the courts' budget. The courts appoint and supervise the chief probation officer and the probation staff. However, the probation department is funded under the county's, not the court's, budget. This has placed the probation dept. in an awkward situation and is causing a widening rift within the county. Obviously, this is not a good situation. The probation department should work under, and be funded by, the same entity: either the courts or the county. The current splitting of jurisdiction and funding should be addressed and resolved at some point as this report evolves.	Governance	Phase II.
Michael F. Brown County Administrator	County of Santa Barbara Administrator's Office		Do not agree	Since the board of supervisors has to fund probation they should have the authority to control the department, hire and fire the chief. If the judiciary wants to control it, it should be in the state judiciary budget. The current system violates the separation of powers of doctrine and subverts accountability. The judges pressure the board of supervisors to increase the probation budget but are not accountable to the voters for the taxes.	Governance	Phase II.
Gerald L. Gleeson Public Defender	San Joaquin County Public Defenders Office		Agree only if modified	Omit recommendation 3.	Mission statements	Disagree. The task force believes the recommendation is necessary to improve probation services.
Stephen Heggen Supervising Probation Officer	El Dorado County Probation		Do not agree	A mission statement defines the purpose of the organization. Goals and objectives define the plan to fulfill the purpose of the organization. Goals and objectives define the plan to fulfill the mission. Goals and objectives (measurable, attainable and all that management 101 stuff), should be modified in a planned and consistent manner and are best served in the form of a living document. An annual review is not sufficient to serve that purpose. The mission statement would usually not change for a period of three to five years and then only minor changes to refocus the organization. Mission statement (purpose of organization) is a separate document from plans to fulfill mission (goals and objectives). One cannot exist without the other, but they each serve a different purpose.	Mission statements	Agree. The task force is recommending the development of mission statements to last for more than one year, with annual review to ensure that the department is meeting the mission; the task force is not suggesting annual revision. The report will be revised to clarify this point.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Bekki Riggan Principal Management Analyst	Placer County Executive Office		Agree	In encouraging the development and implementation of results-based planning that establishes goals, standards and outcome measures, Recommendations 3–6 are among the most significant from a county management perspective. Allocating scarce resources among competing needs at the local level requires outcome-based information regarding programs and approaches proven to be the most effective with offender populations. In addition, this type of data will help strengthen the collaborative partnerships among the local stakeholders such as the courts, law enforcement, prosecution and defense attorneys, and service providers who collectively see to the local administration of justice. Placer County is currently practicing a number of the approaches discussed in Recommendation 17, which calls for a balanced approach to probation blending offender accountability, victim restoration, competency development, and community collaboration.	Mission statements	No response necessary.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Recommendation 3: Agree. The mission statement ought to be publicly available since probation is a public institution. It's hard to imagine 58 unique mission statements; common goals can be articulated with direction from the state.	Mission statements	No response necessary.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Consider the possibility of merging Recommendations 3 and 4.	Mission statements	Disagree. Mission statements and goals and objectives, although related, are not necessarily connected.
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	Recommendation 3: We have done that and will continue to do so. The mission statement and goals are reviewed each year in conjunction with budget preparation.	Mission statements	No response necessary.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	Recommendation 3: Yes they should! Who will hold the CPO's accountable? I have given my argument against 59 mission statements. One mission statement that clearly defines probation's role can include a phrase that gives local flexibility. For complete comments, see tab 41.	Mission statements	Agree. During phase II, CPOC will develop a mission statement to replace the one developed in 1980; however, the task force believes that each probation department should also independently develop a mission statement taking into account local considerations for use in its jurisdiction.
Mari Beraz County Administrative Officer	Monterey County Administrator's Office	X	Blank	Monterey County supports the fundamental concepts of recommendations 1 through 7. The county fully supports further review and strategy development in these areas to more specifically define methods, procedures, and needs, and to identify support mechanisms for achieving successful implementation of final recommendations by individual probation departments statewide. It should be noted that final recommendations must be flexible to local circumstances, needs and abilities, as determined by individual counties.	Mission statements	No response necessary.
Gerald L. Gleeson Public Defender	San Joaquin County Public Defenders Office		Agree only if modified	Omit recommendation 4.	Goals and objectives	Disagree. The task force believes the recommendation is necessary to improve probation services.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Stephen Heggen Supervising Probation Officer	El Dorado County Probation		Do not agree	A mission statement defines the purpose of the organization. Goals and objectives define the plan to fulfill the purpose of the organization. Goals and objectives define the plan to fulfill the mission. Goals and objectives (measurable, attainable and all that management 101 stuff) should be modified in a planned and consistent manner and are best served in the form of a living document. An annual review is not sufficient to serve that purpose. The mission statement would usually not change for a period of three to five years and then only minor changes to refocus the organization. Mission statement (purpose of organization) is a separate document from plans to fulfill mission (goals and objectives). One cannot exist without the other, but they each serve a different purpose.	Goals and objectives	Agree. The task force is recommending the development of mission statements to last for more than one year, with annual review to ensure that the department is meeting the mission; the task force is not suggesting annual revision. The report will be revised to clarify this point.
Larry Parish County Executive Officer	County of Riverside, Executive Office	X	Blank	Riverside County supports measurable outcomes based on a uniform definition of probation.	Goals and objectives	No response necessary.
Bekki Riggan Principal Management Analyst	Placer County Executive Office		Agree	In encouraging the development and implementation of results-based planning that establishes goals, standards and outcome measures, Recommendations 3-6 are among the most significant from a county management perspective. Allocating scarce resources among competing needs at the local level requires outcome-based information regarding programs and approaches proven to be the most effective with offender populations. In addition, this type of data will help strengthen the collaborative partnerships among the local stakeholders such as the courts, law enforcement, prosecution and defense attorneys, and service providers who collectively see to the local administration of justice. Placer County is currently practicing a number of the approaches discussed in Recommendation 17, which calls for a balanced approach to probation blending offender accountability, victim restoration, competency development, and community collaboration.	Goals and objectives	No response necessary.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Recommendation 4: Agree. Once the governance issue (Rec. 2) is solved, the development of measurable outcomes can proceed. There will be a link between funding and oversight; only then does it become reasonable to hold departments accountable to outcomes.	Goals and objectives	No response necessary.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Recommendations 4 through 7 are all about the ingredients needed to develop a case management system; they could all be reframed with that overarching goal in mind. (They could even be merged into one recommendation.)	Goals and objectives	Disagree. The task force believes the recommendation is necessary to improve probation services.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Consider the possibility of merging Recommendations 3 and 4.	Goals and objectives	Disagree. Mission statements and goals and objectives, although related, are not necessarily connected.
Stephen Birdleough	Friends Committee on Legislation of California		Blank	In recommendation 4, note that outcomes can be measured by the educational progress, relationship formation, leadership roles, and the taxable income generated by probationers over an extended period of time.	Goals and objectives	Agree. Will revise text to include examples of outcome measures.
Wendy Watanabe Assistant Division Chief	Los Angeles County Chief Administrator's Office		Agree	Concur with the draft Probation Services Task Force's Interim Report recommendations with a primary focus on: the need for incorporating measurable outcomes, through the continue commitment to an ongoing outcome measurement program which serves in the evaluation of service effectiveness, and supports expansion or alteration of programs.	Goals and objectives	No response necessary.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	Recommendation 4: Many of the grants we receive require measurable outcomes. I apply these outcomes to other programs within the department and to the department as a whole.	Goals and objectives	No response necessary.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	Recommendation 4: This is the control function that should be centralized in order for accountability. Control is the last phase, and will be implemented by management. For complete comments, see tab 41.	Goals and objectives	No response necessary.
Mari Beraz County Administrative Officer	Monterey County Administrator's Office	X	Blank	Monterey County supports the fundamental concepts of recommendations 1 through 7. The county fully supports further review and strategy development in these areas to more specifically define methods, procedures, and needs, and to identify support mechanisms for achieving successful implementation of final recommendations by individual probation departments statewide. It should be noted that final recommendations must be flexible to local circumstances, needs and abilities, as determined by individual counties.	Goals and objectives	No response necessary.
Gerald L. Gleeson Public Defender	San Joaquin County Public Defenders Office		Agree only if modified	Omit recommendation 5.	Communication	Disagree. The task force believes the recommendation is necessary to improve probation services.
Bekki Riggan Principal Management Analyst	Placer County Executive Office		Agree	In encouraging the development and implementation of results-based planning that establishes goals, standards and outcome measures, Recommendations 3–6 are among the most significant from a county management perspective. Allocating scarce resources among competing needs at the local level requires outcome-based information regarding programs and approaches proven to be the most effective with offender populations. In addition, this type of data will help strengthen the collaborative partnerships among the local stakeholders such as the courts, law enforcement, prosecution and defense attorneys, and service providers who collectively see to the local administration of justice. Placer County is currently practicing a number of the approaches discussed in Recommendation 17, which calls for a balanced approach to probation blending offender accountability, victim restoration, competency development, and community collaboration.	Communication	No response necessary.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	Recommendation 5: I have seen the word <i>statewide</i> throughout the report. This trend has led me to view probation as a state function. If so, why do we say “administered” at the “local level?” That is why I hope you mean “managed” or “executed” at the local level. For complete comments, see tab 41.	Communication	No response necessary.
Mari Beraz County Administrative Officer	Monterey County Administrator's Office	X	Blank	Monterey County supports the fundamental concepts of recommendations 1 through 7. The county fully supports further review and strategy development in these areas to more specifically define methods, procedures, and needs, and to identify support mechanisms for achieving successful implementation of final recommendations by individual probation departments statewide. It should be noted that final recommendations must be flexible to local circumstances, needs and abilities, as determined by individual counties.	Communication	No response necessary.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Recommendation 5: Agree. Again, a system where commonality is mandated is not feasible until change in governance is achieved. (Funding is the principal tool of control.)	Language	No response necessary.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Recommendations 4 through 7 are all about the ingredients needed to develop a case management system; they could all be reframed with that overarching goal in mind. (They could even be merged into one recommendation.)	Language	Disagree. The task force believes the recommendation is necessary to improve probation services.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
James Rowland Chief Probation Officer	Napa County Probation Department	X	Agree	The development of a common statewide language has potentially great benefit in facilitating improved communication and information sharing among counties, but may limit individual counties of varying sizes and demographics from tailoring individualized solutions to their own needs.	Language	No response necessary.
Richmond, Harlan, Vinson, Krilelich	Amador County Superior Court, Board of Supervisors, and Probation Department	X	Blank	Recommendation 5 discusses a common language for probation statewide. This may be appropriate in most cases; however, the diversity of California may hamper a language that will be appropriate in all jurisdictions. An example of the diversity of California is the vast difference between what may be important to stakeholders in Los Angeles compared to stakeholders in Alpine County.	Language	Phase II.
Stephen Birdleough	Friends Committee on Legislation of California		Blank	Communication, identification, and human interaction technologies are developing at rates that are likely to strongly challenge traditional probation processes. The report would do well to acknowledge some of these factors. Hopefully, the task force is well on its way to address them.	Language	Phase II.
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	Recommendation 5: I agree that a problem exists in this area. What we called "supervising probation officers" until recently were called "division directors or managers" in larger counties. Programs of the same ilk are called many different things. This is a task for the Assistant Probations Association that should be assigned by CPOC.	Language	Phase II.
Gerald L. Gleeson Public Defender	San Joaquin County Public Defenders Office		Agree only if modified	Omit recommendation 6.	Technology	Disagree. The task force believes the recommendation is necessary to improve probation services.
Bekki Riggan Principal Management Analyst	Placer County Executive Office		Agree	In encouraging the development and implementation of results-based planning that establishes goals, standards and outcome measures, Recommendations 3–6 are among the most significant from a county management perspective. Allocating scarce resources among competing needs at the local level requires outcome- based information regarding programs and approaches proven to be the most effective with offender populations. In addition, this type of data will help strengthen the collaborative partnerships among the local stakeholders such as the courts, law enforcement, prosecution and defense attorneys, and service providers who collectively see to the local administration of justice. Placer County is currently practicing a number of the approaches discussed in Recommendation 17, which calls for a balanced approach to probation blending offender accountability, victim restoration, competency development, and community collaboration.	Technology	No response necessary.
Kimberly Barrett Chief Probation Officer	San Luis Obispo Probation Dept.		Agree	Probation desperately needs technology to measure what we do so well!	Technology	No response necessary.
Doris Foster Assistant Management Consultant	Stanislaus County - Chief Executive Office		Agree only if modified	Recommendation 6: Probation technology resources should be reconfigured and augmented BY THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA to enhance statewide communication and improve operational systems, resource allocation, and capacity for evaluation.	Technology	Phase II.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Recommendation 6: Agree. Linked technology systems are especially important in the juvenile arena where very often information from other counties takes too long to arrive at the new court. The governance issue is raised again: There will be no uniformity so long as individual boards of supervisors have to decide to each fund their piece of a new technology.	Technology	No response necessary.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Recommendations 4 through 7 are all about the ingredients needed to develop a case management system; they could all be reframed with that overarching goal in mind. (They could even be merged into one recommendation.)	Technology	Disagree. The task force believes the recommendation is necessary to improve probation services.
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	Recommendation 6: I agree. There are statewide systems for collecting specific data on both juveniles and adults, but no one county system is linked to another. The ability to access and share information would greatly enhance our function as peace officers, and give us the ability to monitor cases throughout the state. At the moment we have an information management system that links the local justice system components (Jalan) but does not interface with municipalities or other non-justice agencies. One of my goals for the Juvenile Assessment Center is the capability to access and share information with other agencies with a need to know, such as Mental Health, Social Services, and the schools.	Technology	No response necessary.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	Recommendation 6: This appears to be a central function. Otherwise, no one has any responsibility to do anything with this information. Who would do the evaluation? Who would take or be obligated to take corrective action? For complete comments, see tab 41.	Technology	No response necessary.
Penelope Clarke Administrator	County of Sacramento Public Protection Agency	X	Blank	Technology Standards: Recommendation 6 suggests a reconfiguration and augmentation to enhance statewide communication and improve operational systems, resource allocation, and capacity for evaluation. The county agrees with the need as long as there is no negative impact to the county's ability to share information. Each component of the justice system requires information that should be centrally available.	Technology	Phase II.
Mari Beraz County Administrative Officer	Monterey County Administrator's Office	X	Blank	Monterey County supports the fundamental concepts of recommendations 1 through 7. The county fully supports further review and strategy development in these areas to more specifically define methods, procedures, and needs, and to identify support mechanisms for achieving successful implementation of final recommendations by individual probation departments statewide. It should be noted that final recommendations must be flexible to local circumstances, needs and abilities, as determined by individual counties.	Technology	No response necessary.
Bob Franklin Executive Director	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)			The issues of intake and exit assessments are a very good recommendation and practice. As a past supervisor of a drug court unit, these instruments were vital in evaluating need, change and program viability. Likewise, educational/cognitive needs and tools are an important consideration for any individual involvement and growth.	Case management	No response necessary.
Bob Franklin Executive Director	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)			In order to incorporate a legitimate intake and outcome assessment program, an intensive training program through the board of corrections (STC) with honest local involvement and support is vital.	Case management	Phase II.
Gerald L. Gleeson Public Defender	San Joaquin County Public Defenders Office		Agree only if modified	Omit recommendation 7.	Case management	Disagree. The task force believes the recommendation is necessary to improve probation services.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Recommendation 7: Agree. Particularly if Recommendation 6 is achieved, the use of assessment and classification for case management becomes feasible. Some counties already do this, but the information is not shared.	Case management	No response necessary.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Recommendations 4 through 7 are all about the ingredients needed to develop a case management system; they could all be reframed with that overarching goal in mind. (They could even be merged into one recommendation.)	Case management	Disagree. The task force believes the recommendation is necessary to improve probation services.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	Recommendation 7: We have used the NIC (Wisconsin) model of assessment and classification for the past twenty years. We are looking into a new assessment tool called the LSI, which has been studied by San Diego County and found to be an effective tool. As the report indicates, a standardized tool should be applied statewide.	Case management	No response necessary.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	Recommendation 7: 59 different ways or one way? I am aware of a department that has assessment tools, but they are not used for effective case management. Where is accountability? For complete comments, see tab 41.	Case management	No response necessary.
Mari Beraz County Administrative Officer	Monterey County Administrator's Office	X	Blank	Monterey County supports the fundamental concepts of recommendations 1 through 7. The county fully supports further review and strategy development in these areas to more specifically define methods, procedures, and needs, and to identify support mechanisms for achieving successful implementation of final recommendations by individual probation departments statewide. It should be noted that final recommendations must be flexible to local circumstances, needs and abilities, as determined by individual counties.	Case management	No response necessary.
Gerald L. Gleason Public Defender	San Joaquin County Public Defenders Office		Agree only if modified	Revise recommendation 8 to read: Probation departments should be reconfigured to supply services to offender and extended families through a variety of sources and agencies. The collaborations should include alcohol and drug rehabilitation, mental health, job training, counseling, housing, etc.	Services	Disagree. Too specific; rehabilitation and accountability must both be part of a continuum.
Andy Pickett Administrative Analyst	Sonoma County Administrator's Office		Blank	Wouldn't recommendation 8 put probation in a position of doing what the bench should be doing?	Services	Disagree. Probation has responsibility for probationers under its jurisdiction.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Recommendation 8: Agree. This presupposes recommendation 7.	Services	No response necessary.
Stephen Birdleough	Friends Committee on Legislation of California		Blank	The report fails to emphasize the importance of multilingual competence, cultural sensitivity, or community involvement in setting goals. All public agencies have trouble remaining current with shifts in ethnic and cultural currents in the population. It is of particular importance that probation services elevate this issue to a high priority.	Services	No response necessary.
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	Recommendation 8: We employ a graduated continuum of sanctions in the adult courts and supervision unit. From Prop 36 to Adult Drug Court to formal probation is the current example for drug offenders. However, without the concurrence of the court, which makes the final decision in any case, graduated sanctions are often ignored to address the magnitude of the offense, rather than the offender's needs. It is the role of the probation officer to notify the courts of the available sanctions and to encourage their use.	Services	No response necessary.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	Recommendation 8: What would the extremes of the continuum be? Bank supervision at one end and incarceration at the other? Are we talking about the amount of supervision? Or are we talking about something else? These need to be defined. For complete comments, see tab 41.	Services	No response necessary.
Stephen Heggen Supervising Probation Officer	El Dorado County Probation		Do not agree	Probation services focuses on juvenile services because they are mandated by statute. The Welfare and Institutions Code is much more specific about juvenile probation and services than is the Penal Code for comparable adult services.	Services	Agree. Will revise text.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Phil Erdman President	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)		Agree only if modified	I am much in defense of probation's role. In some of the findings, the report emphasizes the need for probation departments/officers to be more knowledgeable, be more active, become more involved, and take on more responsibilities. Then, in other findings, the report stresses that probation departments/officers have overextended caseloads, lack personnel to carry out court-ordered mandates, and are stretched to the limit because of the lack of stable and adequate funding. These "findings" have resulted in the report producing conflicting recommendations. It can't be both ways.	Services	Disagree. Report seeks to explain the current situation while recommending future changes for improvement.
Bruce West Deputy Probation Officer	San Luis Obispo County Probation Department		Blank	Concerns include: The urgent need to standardize funding and services across the state to prevent the all-too-common practice of "jurisdiction shopping" by convicted felons looking for a location where they can avoid supervision by moving to a county that is unable to accept or supervise out-of-county cases.	Services	Phase II.
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	In terms of service delivery, the task force report is quite accurate. Probation services should be administered at the local level, and standards and measurable outcomes are imperative. Recruiting and retention, training, salary and benefits (including safety retirement), and officer safety are all issues that have been studied and addressed since I became chief. The effects of mounting caseloads and workloads, recognition in the community, and the role of the probation officer in law enforcement and public safety are currently being addressed throughout the state by the Chief Probation Officers of California Association (CPOC). I am pleased to see how our department is being recognized locally by schools, law enforcement officials, and other agencies as a leader in collaboration and public involvement. The new Juvenile Assessment Center is an excellent example of how the community is coming together to identify youth at risk of entering the juvenile justice system and interceding well before they are labeled as delinquents.	Services	No response necessary.
Mari Beraz County Administrative Officer	Monterey County Administrator's Office	X	Blank	The fundamental principles of recommendations 8 and 9 appear sound, and Monterey County probation attempts to provide services in this manner where circumstances allow. Further definition, scope, and clarification of authority and responsibility, however, are needed before the county can agree or disagree with formal adoption of these recommendations.	Services	No response necessary.
Bob Franklin Executive Director	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)			On Pages 7, 9 and 41 reference is made to probation departments concentrating efforts on juvenile probation services. Much of this effort is toward prevention and early intervention. These words are rarely used in reference to adult services. In both levels much of the effort is dictated by funding sources. As counties contribute less to probation departments we are forced to "chase the dollars" to continue services. This is contrary to efforts in determining need, adult efforts and the design of and delivery of services that may best reduce future criminality in the adult population and thus provide more realistic long-term protection to the community. If we are ever able to move toward a preventive, early-intervention expectation for both adults and juveniles, a means may be necessary to discourage the courts from placing offenders with numerous violations of probation, parole, long or excessive periods of incarceration and a well-established criminal lifestyle on additional grants of probation. These cases do demand attention to "protect the community" but also prevent proactive supervision of those probationers more able to make positive change. Are we not conducting our departments on a "feel-good basis": i.e., working with the children over the reality of working with individuals with early criminality at any age when they are most receptive to efforts of rehabilitation and positive change? If only 11 to 13% of all adult probationers had any contact with juvenile authority and if most adult probationers, up to 80% in some jurisdictions based on national statistics, are in the age range of 24–30 when first referred to probation, are we not continuing to endanger the community and fostering further criminality if we provide only minimal intervention or bank these individuals? Why must an adult wait until their criminality grows in severity and lifestyle before we provide at least some effort toward prevention and early intervention?	Prevention and early intervention	Phase II.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Recommendation 9: Agree. This is a valuable recommendation that few would take exception to. It reflects an orientation that is shared by probation officers. Juvenile probation has developed service models for prevention and early intervention; adult probation could probably attend to this issue better. Particularly with the adult population, this would cost a lot of money.	Prevention and early intervention	No response necessary.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		There are interesting issues regarding centralization and governance, beyond the fact that Recommendation 2 must be addressed before Recommendation 9 can be considered. An issue that would arise as this recommendation is implemented is: Would we have a system that allows localities to identify cases for prevention and early intervention that are based in local standards? (e.g., courts may differ in how they view misdemeanor drug possession and those differences may be grounded in legitimate views about the link—in those communities—between that offense, on the one hand, and harm and risk, on the other.)	Prevention and early intervention	Phase II.
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	Recommendation 9: I wholeheartedly agree with this recommendation, not only in the juvenile arena, but also for adults. Our officers spend a great deal of time in prevention work by going out to the schools and presenting information about crime and drugs. We have officers doing public presentations and representing the department in public forums. The Juvenile Assessment Center is founded on the principle of early intervention, getting to those identified children before they enter the system. With adults it is not easy, in that we receive adult probationers from the courts after they have offended and entered the system. However, we have speakers who do presentations on domestic violence and drug interventions. We screen and monitor counseling programs developed to intercede in potentially dangerous behavior, and hold clients accountable for completing these programs. As silly as it may sound, I support those prevention and early intervention efforts that have the potential of putting probation out of business by creating an offender-less society.	Prevention and early intervention	No response necessary.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	Recommendation 9: What is meant by “early intervention?” Is this pre-arrest, informal probation or age related? Prevention is a hard thing to measure. How would probation be held accountable, or who should be held accountable? This is an example of a probation task that does not fall under the court, but is considered essential. For complete comments, see tab 41.	Prevention and early intervention	Agree. Report will be revised to include a definition of early intervention.
Mari Beraz County Administrative Officer	Monterey County Administrator’s Office	X	Blank	The fundamental principles of recommendations 8 and 9 appear sound, and Monterey County probation attempts to provide services in this manner where circumstances allow. Further definition, scope, and clarification of authority and responsibility, however, are needed before the county can agree or disagree with formal adoption of these recommendations.	Prevention and early intervention	No response necessary.
Bob Franklin Executive Director	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)			Page 72; Collaboration works, especially in programs such as drug courts, domestic violence and mental health programs. However, there has been a long history of resistance to formal assessments as being too time consuming, leading to inaccurate findings, and discerning needs of the individual without corrective programming being available. Some juvenile officers talk of the frustration of discerning needs and their recommendations being rebuked by resource review boards in relation to funding, space availability and the desire to balance referrals to various providers. This increases the resistance to conducting assessments and mistrust of administrators by local DPOs.	Collaboration	No response necessary.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Recommendation 10: Agree. The more probation collaborates (in multidisciplinary teams; in securing services from other agencies and CBOs) the more the probation officer becomes a hybrid of law enforcement and social worker. The report’s treatment of this recommendation (and the several that follow) should include a discussion of the implications of heightened collaboration and the changing face of the probation officer. There are also hidden costs (salary) in this vision that ought to be acknowledged.	Collaboration	No response necessary.
Bart Bohn County Administrative Officer	Fresno County Administrator’s Office		Blank	As the Fresno County Administrative Officer, I am pleased to have such a strong collaborative working relationship with Chief Probation Officer Larry Price. The Fresno County continuum of services model has a strong emphasis on prevention, early intervention, community corrections, and incarceration. The task force report clearly agrees with this balanced approach and it was pleasing to see we are working within the boundaries of many of the recommendations.	Collaboration	No response necessary.
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	Recommendation 10: the partnership is essential to establishing the level of services required by the court with the funding and support from the county. Without that connection, it is difficult to move forward and be innovative, while trying to backfill holes in the continuum of services.	Collaboration	No response necessary.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	It is important to each chief probation officer to feel the support of his board of supervisors, his CAO, and his judges. In the context of the issues expressed in the report, I believe that I have that support in Mendocino County. As a result of this study, there will be changes in the way the courts and counties collaborate to ensure public safety and community corrections. I sincerely feel that we have paved the way through our many collaborations and will be able to resolve these issues and implement the recommendations of the task force.	Collaboration	No response necessary.
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	I wish to respond to each of the task force recommendations individually, but first I must address the common theme of the courts and counties developing "partnerships to administer probation departments and work collaboratively to ensure appropriate levels of services, support, funding, and oversight." I believe that Mendocino County government is unique in its ability to break down communication barriers and to collaborate in the best interests of all parties involved. However, the historical problems created by the shift to state funding for trial courts, while leaving probation services with the county, have not been resolved and will continue to impede progress in resolving the governance issue. To achieve a connection between "authority over and responsibility for the conduct, support, funding, oversight, and administration ... including the appointment of the CPO" will be problematic.	Collaboration	Phase II.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	Recommendation 10: I have given my opinion to partnerships/collaborative arrangements—no RAA (Responsibility, Accountability, and Authority). For complete comments, see tab 41.	Collaboration	No response necessary.
Mari Beraz County Administrative Officer	Monterey County	X	Blank	Monterey County supports recommendation 10 and implements this practice where circumstances allow.	Collaboration	No response necessary.
Stephen Birdlebough	Friends Committee on Legislation of California		Blank	Burn out and compassion fatigue are key issues that are not directly addressed in the study. Yet these factors are at the heart of any relational system such as probation. Extensive use of volunteers is one of the most effective ways to cope with such issues, but I could not find that the development of programs to exploit volunteer services is addressed. Please give some evidence of careful thought on these issues.	DPO issues	Disagree. Local management issue encompassed in rec. 10.
Doris Foster Assistant Management Consultant	Stanislaus County - Chief Executive Office		Agree only if modified	Suggest replacing Recommendation 15 with the following text: PROBATION DEPARTMENTS SHOULD COORDINATE WITH LOCAL MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES PROVIDERS TO COORDINATE THE PROVISION OF SERVICES TO PROBATIONERS.		Disagree. Concepts are included in rec. 10; therefore, there is no need for a separate recommendation. Further, the task force believes that rec. 15 is critical in ensuring that adults receive educational and vocational training.
Stephen Birdlebough	Friends Committee on Legislation of California		Blank	There is a constant tension between the immediate needs of the victims and offenders in the system, and the time-consuming demands of due process. Particularly for juvenile victims and offenders, the importance of the next 24 hours completely obscures the importance of events of other next 90 days. A probation system must make sense of both immediate demands of clients, and the long-term due process demands of the judiciary. It would be helpful to establish a consensus that addresses more clearly the important hour-to-hour events that tend to fall below the judicial "radar," such as victim-offender relationships, mental health needs, and family counseling requirements.	Services	No response necessary.
J. Warchol Chief Probation Officer	El Dorado County Probation Department		Blank	Caseload and workloads should have priority with the task force. Depending on resources of the various counties, the numbers differ. A review of state and federal caseload and workload standards may be a good place to start. In any case, this is a difficult issue to nail down.	Caseload / workload	No response necessary?/Phase II issue.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Gerald L. Gleeson Public Defender	San Joaquin County Public Defenders Office		Agree only if modified	Omit recommendation 11.	Caseload / Workload	Disagree. The task force believes the recommendation is necessary to improve probation services.
Alice Vilardi Judge	Superior Court of California, County of Alameda		Agree only if modified	The next phase of the study might examine workload and governance solutions used in the parole system in the state, as well as look at the federal probation system. While there are obvious and significant differences among the systems, both the state parole system and federal probation system have had to deal with several of the comparative workload and with some of the governance issues identified in the draft report. An examination of those solutions might be helpful in identifying solutions that would definitely not work in the California probation system and those that may merit further exploration.	Caseload / workload	Phase II.
Phil Erdman President	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)		Agree only if modified	I am much in defense of probation's role. In some of the findings, the report emphasizes the need for probation departments/officers to be more knowledgeable, be more active, become more involved, and take on more responsibilities. Then, in other findings, the report stresses that probation departments/officers have overextended caseloads, lack personnel to carry out court ordered mandates, and are stretched to the limit because of the lack of stable and adequate funding. These "findings" have resulted in the report producing conflicting recommendations. It can't be both ways.	Caseload / workload	Disagree. Report seeks to explain the current situation while recommending future changes for improvement.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Recommendation 11: Agree. This has interesting administrative implication; it's not clear that judges would have the knowledge of personnel administration required to pass judgment on this recommendation. Again, there are financial implications (increased salaries) that should be acknowledged.	Caseload / workload	No response necessary.
Bruce West Deputy Probation Officer	San Luis Obispo County Probation Department		Blank	Concerns include: The meanings of "caseload and workload standards." I was fortunate to be present at Dennis Mahoney's presentation to the task force and I would recommend that consideration be given to the salient point that he made regarding standards, which he referred to as "inputs," or DPO activities, as opposed to "outcomes" or offender behaviors, which is where we need to keep our focus.	Caseload / workload	Phase II.
Richmond, Harlan, Vinson, Kriletich	Amador County Superior Court, Board of Supervisors, and Probation Department	X	Blank	Recommendation 11 discusses workload rather than caseload ratios. We agree, "Each case should be given a weighted value depending on the risks and needs associated with the probationers." This type of system is a direct connection to the balanced justice model, which includes community safety, offender accountability, competency development, victim restoration and collaboration.	Caseload / workload	No response necessary.
	San Luis Obispo County Probation	X	Agree	Probation casework should be looked at with the same care that a detective investigating a new crime is asked to do. It is unfortunate that the numbers of felons far outnumber the amount of probation officers. Prioritizing cases is important. But so many "risk assessments" are inaccurate. We found the computerized risk assessment tool mentioned an interesting concept. However, we are sure that many county governments would feel it was cost prohibitive.	Caseload / workload	No response necessary.
	San Luis Obispo County Probation	X	Agree	Because of the growing numbers of adults and juveniles under supervision, staffing levels are wholly inadequate. Officers are overwhelmed on a daily basis, and must often make a choice on who to contact and who to put off "for another week." While we watch our agency struggle to obtain any positions over the years, we also watch our local law enforcement agencies grow in staffing, equipment and even new buildings. The same appears to occur in the department of social services. We know why this is.	Caseload / workload	No response necessary.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	Recommendation 11: A classification system that measures the needs and risks of each individual client shows that no one case is identical to another in terms of services needed. However, the amount of time spent on any one case is more indicative of the workload than the number of cases assigned to an individual officer. For example, welfare fraud offenders tend to not need direct supervision if they are paying restitution regularly, whereas a drug offender may require frequent testing and searching. Drug offender caseloads must therefore be smaller to accommodate the amount of time and officers necessary for supervision. Surprisingly, sex offenders tend to be very compliant with the terms of probation for reporting and attending counseling, but need constant surveillance to ensure reported whereabouts. Many of our sex offenders travel great distances without our knowledge. We have been conscious of workload vs. caseload issues for many years. Because of the large number of adult offenders and the number of supervising probation officers, we too have had to implement banked caseloads of low-profile clients to keep up with the workload demands of high-intensity cases.	Caseload / workload	No response necessary.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	Recommendation 11: I couldn't agree more! However, parole has the caseload standards, grants stipulate caseloads, and the vast majority of DPOs want this. I have argued that workload standards are far more appropriate but it played to deaf ears. Caseload standards are being negotiated today. For complete comments, see tab 41.	Caseload / workload	No response necessary.
Penelope Clarke Administrator	County of Sacramento Public Protection Agency	X	Blank	Workload Standards: Recommendation 11 suggests probation departments adopt workload standards rather than caseload ratios. The county agrees that workload standards are beneficial management tools but does not believe the standards should be mandated. Any recommended standards should be flexible enough to conform within county financing.	Caseload / workload	No response necessary.
Mari Beraz County Administrative Officer	Monterey County Administrator's Office	X	Blank	Monterey County supports recommendation 11 where applicable.	Caseload / workload	No response necessary.
Gerald L. Gleeson Public Defender	San Joaquin County Public Defenders Office		Agree only if modified	Revise recommendation 12 to read: Probation officers should be trained to ensure that children's educational rights are provided, investigated and monitored where necessary.	Education	Disagree.
Alice Vilardi Judge	Superior Court of California, County of Alameda		Agree only if modified	Recommendation 12 should explicitly refer to probation officers assigned to juvenile probation: Perhaps "Probation officers assigned to juvenile probationers should be trained to ensure that children's educational rights are investigated, reported, and monitored."	Education	Disagree? Do we want all probation officers trained?
Phil Erdman President	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)		Agree only if modified	In relation to school-based probation officers, it is not the "community's" role to consider. It is a decision between the probation department and the school district. The services outlined are a little extreme and could only happen "in a perfect world."	Education	Disagree?
Phil Erdman President	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)		Agree only if modified	In my 32-year probation career, I have never believed probation officers have ever discounted the importance of education in a juvenile's life. I do not agree that probation officers need more "education and educational training to raise awareness" ... and to "recognize" if a juvenile has a disability. Far too long have the schools fallen short in this area and it has been my experience that the schools are not being responsible in this area and need to pick up this slack. It is the teachers that need to be trained in the areas of awareness that you have mentioned. Your discussion of this area should point out that schools should be aware of federal and state special education laws and types of disabilities and it should be their responsibility to address and respond to these issues. This should not be placed on the backs of the probation officer.	Education	
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	Recommendation 12: I concur. This is an essential part of our reports to the court and our supervision plans. Training is available through the board of corrections and with our local schools.	Education	No response necessary.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

<b>Full Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>On Behalf of a Group</b>	<b>Check Box</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Theme / Topic</b>	<b>Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue</b>
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	Recommendation 12: Do we really want to hold probation accountable? Is this not really education departments' responsibility? For complete comments, see tab 41.	Education	
Mari Beraz County Administrative Officer	Monterey County Administrator's Office	X	Blank	Monterey County probation currently implements these practices where appropriate. As put forward, however, these recommendations are broad and open to areas of dispute between other agencies. Additional scope and clarification to define areas of responsibility and authority are needed before Monterey County can agree or disagree with adoption of either recommendation 12 or 13.	Education	No response necessary.
Phil Erdman President	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)		Agree only if modified	The report does not seem to emphasize that "inadequate education" factors were present BEFORE the juvenile entered the juvenile justice system. Probation officers, in their investigation, already make note of these areas to the court. It is within the schools' responsibility to identify and address the poor performance, attendance, low test scores, reading levels, etc. before a juvenile enters the court system.	Education	Agree.
Thomas Folena Editor in Chief	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)		Agree only if modified	Recommendations 12 and 13. If these are to ensure that the probation officer knows the legal rights of school children, that's great, they need to know this information. What concerns me, after working for 26 years in the probation system, is that school administrators have forever fought the probation officer's intervention. School administrators look to us for removal of their problem and not for us to help keep the problem in school. I can't tell you how many meetings I have sat through and pleaded with the school officials to not expel a child. It has been my experience that when a child is identified as trouble you are fighting a losing battle.	Education	
Bob Franklin Executive Director	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)			If a department moves toward an intensive response to educational needs, formal training on relevance as well as clearly stated expectations for delivery and outcome must be unwavering. Such a program was tried in a Bay Area county in the mid-1990s. It failed due to unrestrained resistance and a distrust of the motive and merit of the program.	Education	
Phil Erdman President	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)		Agree only if modified	It is well known that all of those who provide services to adult and youth need to be on the same page and work together, but there is much, too much stone throwing and lack of accountability. For instance, if those in education would really address the educational issues you have mentioned probation officers should tackle, there might be a reduction in delinquency based on the education factor alone. If those in education would seriously address their contribution to delinquency, then maybe the probation departments and officers could handle the rest of the load.	Education	No response necessary.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Recommendations 12–15: Agree. The panel was pleased to see these recommendations on a very important subject. It is possible to merge them into one recommendation about education. In the next round of thought, the task force may want to involve the education department. Regarding the issue of training on education rights: The complexities of this ever-changing subject suggests that it may be more efficient to have subject-matter experts on staff (PO specialists) than train each line staff in the intricacies of the law and practice. Once again, it is noteworthy that asking the probation officer to become an education advocate is related to the hybrid law enforcement / social worker image of the probation officer.	Education	Agree?
Richmond, Harlan, Vinson, Kriletich	Amador County Superior Court, Board of Supervisors, and Probation Department	X	Blank	Recommendations 12–15 discuss the need for appropriate educational intervention in the lives of adult and juvenile offenders. Educational success and competency development are directly related. The concern we have with these recommendations is the absence of educational officials participating in the discussions. Currently, our officers are doing everything they can to ensure the educational rights of adults and minors are protected and the efforts of parents and school officials are supported. Education officials need to be part of the discussion in order to make this a successful collaboration.	Education	
Gerald L. Gleeson Public Defender	San Joaquin County Public Defenders Office		Agree only if modified	Agree with recommendation 13 as submitted.	Education	No response necessary.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Phil Erdman President	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)		Agree only if modified	It is well documented that there is a disproportionate number of students within the juvenile justice system who have had "inadequate education." What do you define as "inadequate education?" Is it in reference to the level the school district can provide services, poor teacher performance, or an inadequate school budget? Or is it in reference to the student's poor attendance, below-grade-level performance in the main academic subjects, and low scores on those mandated scholastic tests? If "inadequate education" is in reference to the latter, then all or most of these factors are common with juveniles and adults that are currently in the justice system.	Education	Agree. Will revise.
Phil Erdman President	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)		Agree only if modified	My experience has led me to believe that the schools contribute to a juvenile's delinquency as much as a dysfunctional home life. Although the Standards of Judicial Administration were amended to require the court to address this issue, I feel that task force should place more emphasis for schools to be more responsible and accountable in all phases of the educational process. The educational systems should recognize and adopt a mission statement that recognizes that identifying and providing the necessary and mandatory educational needs at an early age is "delinquency prevention." (Maybe there can be an "Educational Services Task Force" formed to look into these issues.)	Education	Disagree. Beyond scope of the task force.
Phil Erdman President	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)		Agree only if modified	Truancy has also been linked to delinquency. However I believe that establishing a "truancy prevention program" should start with the schools, with support from local law enforcement. Again, the probation department cannot be the "catch-all" department for many of the juvenile "ills" that are part of today's society.	Education	Disagree?
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	Recommendation 13: This is currently being accomplished in many ways, through School Attendance Review Boards, the Interagency Case Management Team for the Systems of Care, the new Juvenile Assessment Center, and working directly with the schools. An individual education plan is prepared for each ward with which we work.	Education	No response necessary.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	Recommendation 13: What would that help entail? What would be probation's responsibility here? For complete comments, see tab 41.	Education	
Mari Beraz County Administrative Officer	Monterey County	X	Blank	Monterey County probation currently implements these practices where appropriate. As put forward, however, these recommendations are broad and open to areas of dispute between other agencies. Additional scope and clarification to define areas of responsibility and authority are needed before Monterey County can agree or disagree with adoption of either recommendation 12 or 13.	Education	No response necessary.
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	Recommendation 14: We work very closely with the county office of education to provide appropriate educational services in our court schools, the juvenile hall, and the PACE (Probation Alternatives in Counseling and Education) Program in the Children's Care.	Education	No response necessary.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	Recommendation 14: Probation officers now have become educators by determining "proper" services. For complete comments, see tab 41.	Education	
Mari Beraz County Administrative Officer	Monterey County Administrator's Office	X	Blank	Monterey County supports recommendations 14 and 15 and currently implements these practices.	Education	No response necessary.
Andy Pickett Administrative Analyst	Sonoma County Administrator's Office		Blank	Recommendation 14 and 15 These appear to push probation departments into more of a social work arena rather than public safety.	Education	Disagree.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Doris Foster Assistant Management Consultant	Stanislaus County - Chief Executive Office		Agree only if modified	Suggest replacing Recommendation 15 with the following text: PROBATION DEPARTMENTS SHOULD COORDINATE WITH LOCAL MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES PROVIDERS TO COORDINATE THE PROVISION OF SERVICES TO PROBATIONERS.	Education	Disagree. Concepts are included in rec. 10; therefore, there is no need for a separate recommendation. Further, the task force believes that rec. 15 is critical in ensuring that adults receive educational and vocational training.
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	Recommendation 15: I admit that this is an area that gets little attention. The educational programs for adults usually come through and are assessed by the local college or adult school.	Education	No response necessary.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	Recommendation 15: I am becoming more convinced that probation should be under the education department.	Education	Disagree.
Mari Beraz County Administrative Officer	Monterey County Administrator's Office	X	Blank	Monterey County supports recommendations 14 and 15 and currently implements these practices.	Education	No response necessary.
Gerald L. Gleeson Public Defender	San Joaquin County Public Defenders Office		Agree only if modified	Omit recommendation 16.	Detention reform	Disagree. The task force believes the recommendation is necessary to improve probation services.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Recommendation 16: Agree. The text behind the recommendation's use of the word "appropriate" is disproportionate minority confinement. Panel would prefer to see DMC referred to explicitly in the recommendation.	Detention reform	Disagree. Although the recommendation refers to detention issues related to disproportionate minority confinement, the recommendation is not limited to DMC.
James Rowland Chief Probation Officer	Napa County Probation Department	X	Agree	Though we understand that juvenile detention reform may be of benefit to many counties (especially the larger, urban ones), we believe our present local system adequately addresses appropriate detention, and is able to manage juvenile hall population well. Nevertheless, viable alternatives to detention would be welcome, as well as means to assess and eliminate disproportionate minority detention.	Detention reform	Agree. Will revise to note that the suggested method is one approach and that some counties are working on the issue.
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	Recommendation 16: This is a statewide concern that is currently under scrutiny. I do not believe we have a major problem in this county, but our juvenile court has been imposing longer detention periods than we are accustomed to. This has been discussed amongst the judge, the juvenile division manager, and the juvenile hall superintendent, to find a way to alleviate the problem. The conversation is ongoing.	Detention reform	No response necessary.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	Recommendation 16: As I stated before, juvenile hall should go somewhere better (i.e., CYA) or be focused more on rehabilitation (education) rather than punishment. By centralizing (state level) it would allow for sharing of resources in adjoining counties. For complete comments, see tab 41.	Detention reform	No response necessary.
Mari Beraz County Administrative Officer	Monterey County	X	Blank	Monterey County agrees with recommendation 16.	Detention reform	No response necessary.
Gerald L. Gleeson Public Defender	San Joaquin County Public Defenders Office		Agree only if modified	Agree with recommendation 17 as submitted.	BARJ	No response necessary.
Bekki Riggan Principal Management Analyst	Placer County Executive Office		Agree	In encouraging the development and implementation of results-based planning that establishes goals, standards and outcome measures, Recommendations 3–6 are among the most significant from a county management perspective. Allocating scarce resources among competing needs at the local level requires outcome -based information regarding programs and approaches proven to be the most effective with offender populations. In addition, this type of data will help strengthen the collaborative partnerships among the local stakeholders such as the courts, law enforcement, prosecution and defense attorneys, and service providers who collectively see to the local administration of justice. Placer County is currently practicing a number of the approaches discussed in Recommendation 17, which calls for a balanced approach to probation blending offender accountability, victim restoration, competency development, and community collaboration.	BARJ	No response necessary.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Recommendation 17: Agree. There are concerted efforts in some courts to help this view take hold.	BARJ	No response necessary.
Richmond, Harlan, Vinson, Kriletich	Amador County Superior Court, Board of Supervisors, and Probation Department	X	Blank	Recommendation 17 discusses the balanced justice model of offender accountability, victim restoration, competency development and community collaboration. Amador County supports this recommendation 100%. We believe the probation system needs to be balanced in these areas in order to make it truly successful. In fact, the balanced justice model is exactly what drives our probation department and our community collaborations.	BARJ	No response necessary.
Richmond, Harlan, Vinson, Kriletich	Amador County Superior Court, Board of Supervisors, and Probation Department	X	Blank	In response to recommendation 18, Amador County does not necessarily feel a name change will better reflect probation's function and status. Instead, we believe a paradigm shift to the balanced justice model will help create a better vision, mission and a healthier community. If this is done, probation's function and status will increase in a positive manner.	BARJ	Phase II.
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	Recommendation 17: Be proud of your probation department for being a proponent of restorative justice long before it became a buzzword. Before I became chief, I was one of the few probation officers statewide who recognized the importance of a balanced approach to restorative justice (BARJ), and when I became chief, I adopted that philosophy as the cornerstone for my administration. BARJ espouses the philosophy that an offense does not occur in a vacuum and cannot be treated in a vacuum. An offender must not only be held accountable to the courts, but also to the victim per se, and to the community as a whole. Without repairing the harm done, the offender never puts the offense in the perspective of accountability. Without the community assisting the offender in making that reparation and helping with reintegration into that community, the offender is left with a feeling of alienation and a lack of self-worth. "It Takes a Village" applies to the criminal justice system through the restorative justice philosophy.	BARJ	No response necessary.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	Recommendation 18: A community-centered focus is also an integral part of restorative justice. As much as probation has been like the swinging pendulum, moving between punishment and rehabilitation, and making many stops along the way, the primary focus has always been correcting misguided behavior and repairing the harm done. I believe Community Corrections best reflects our current role. Having spent many hours with Denny Maloney of the Department of Community Justice of Deschutes County, Oregon, I believe that "Justice" and "Corrections" are interchangeable in talking about our missions and goals.	BARJ	Phase II.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not Agree	Recommendation 17: Balancing or juggling? It is necessary to be specific here, so accountability can be established. As an example, Do we really want probation to be held accountable for victim restitution? Is not the district attorney the one who represents the victim? For complete comments, see tab 41.	BARJ	No response necessary.
Mari Beraz County Administrative Officer	Monterey County Administrator's Office	X	Blank	Monterey County agrees with recommendation 17, and where circumstances allow, currently implements this approach.	BARJ	No response necessary.
Gerald L. Gleeson Public Defender	San Joaquin County Public Defenders Office		Agree only if modified	Omit recommendation 18.	Changing role, changing name	Disagree. The task force believes the recommendation is necessary to improve probation services.
Stephen Heggen Supervising Probation Officer	El Dorado County Probation		Do not Agree	Probation is clear to those on probation. A change in definition and status is appropriate; a name change is unwarranted.	Changing role, changing name	Phase II.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X		Recommendation 18: No Position. We have three different views on this matter, which are linked by the common sentiment that the name ought to reflect what is really happening in probation, not an ideal that is not (yet) realized. One: The probation model should be further along in the process of changing to the hybrid system before a name change is warranted. Two: It is disingenuous to give a feel-good name to such a serious process. Three: The new name would reflect the aspirations that the Task Force has for probation, and a name change makes sense in light of these other recommendations.	Changing role, changing name	Phase II.
Thomas Folena Editor in Chief	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)		Agree only if modified	Recommendation 18. This I believe is a big mistake. Probation departments have a hard enough time getting recognition for what they do. To change their name would only muddy the waters more and add to the confusion. What is really needed is the education of the public as to what exactly we do. Most people think we only deal with juveniles and that all we do is counsel them. There needs to be a statewide education campaign to enlighten the general public as to our function in society.	Changing role, changing name	Phase II.
James Rowland Chief Probation Officer	Napa County Probation Department	X	Agree	We are interested in the idea of changing the name "probation" if the new name accurately reflects a new character brought about by changes and developments in the field. We feel care must be taken to ensure that the new name grow out of and reflect our actual role and work more accurately, and not be "window dressing" to hide a lack of real change.	Changing role, changing name	Phase II.
Richmond, Harlan, Vinson, Kriletich	Amador County Superior Court, Board of Supervisors, and Probation Department	X	Blank	In response to recommendation 18, Amador County does not necessarily feel a name change will better reflect probation's function and status. Instead, we believe a paradigm shift to the balanced justice model will help create a better vision, mission and a healthier community. If this is done, probation's function and status will increase in a positive manner.	Changing role, changing name	Phase II.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	Recommendation 18: A community-centered focus is also an integral part of restorative justice. As much as probation has been like the swinging pendulum, moving between punishment and rehabilitation, and making many stops along the way, the primary focus has always been correcting misguided behavior and repairing the harm done. I believe Community Corrections best reflects our current role. Having spent many hours with Denny Maloney of the Department of Community Justice of Deschutes County, Oregon, I believe that "Justice" and "Corrections" are interchangeable in talking about our missions and goals.	Changing role, changing name	Phase II.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	Recommendation 18: I think this could, and should, affect the work of probation as well as educating the public. Perhaps one name for juvenile and another for adult. This would come after the mission statement. For complete comments, see tab 41.	Changing role, changing name	Phase II.
Mari Beraz County Administrative Officer	Monterey County Administrator's Office	X	Blank	Monterey County will await outcomes of further review and analysis by the task force on this issue before offering comment on recommendation 18.	Changing role, changing name	No response necessary.
Bob Franklin Executive Director	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)			ARMING; Page 52, the report states this is a CPO decision best held at the local level based on the best information about safety issues within the county. A real concern is that as probationers become ever more mobile and urban issues spread to all areas of the state, more criminals will believe that ALL probation officers are armed. This raises the bar on consideration to arm POs statewide and to mandate protective gear such as vests, radios, cell phones, etc. It also leads to a need for improved statewide communication and response. This must include a more collaborative involvement with all law enforcement and probation service providers including a wider recognition of the role probation officers play within the community.	DPO issues	Phase II.
	San Luis Obispo County Probation	X	Agree	The deputy probation officer's safety needs are often downplayed, or become restrictive, based on changing philosophies. Firearms, while welcomed by some agencies, are treated with disdain by others. It is very important for people, both within the system and outside observers, to understand that probation is the only agency, besides parole, that deals with 100% convicted or adjudicated persons. Many are repeat offenders, have out-of-control substance abuse, are violent, come from generational criminal homes and so forth. While it is nice to suppose that everyone on probation desires to change, we must be practical in the fact that often many times the criminal behavior or enterprise continues. More than once have we walked into a residence, on a routine probation contact, and located a group of convicted felons engaging in a variety of illegal activities. It is not uncommon to retrieve weapons from the person or their residence. On the other hand, we must say that there are persons on probation who desire the change, work hard, and should be complemented for turning their lives around. People "cure" themselves. Probation officers should not be held responsible for the probationer's successes or failures. We are there to show them the guidelines, explain the court orders, provide referrals for appropriate counseling for the offenders specific needs, and ensure compliance.	DPO issues	Phase II.
Bob Franklin Executive Director	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)			Page 53; safety, retirement, and benefits are vital for recruitment and retention. These issues are possibly more important as a local issue than salary. DPOs often choose work sites/counties on lifestyle choices, not merely salary; however, given similar salaries, the counties, state or federal departments with safety retirement, arming and better retirement benefits always win.	DPO issues	Phase II.
Bob Franklin Executive Director	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)			I have discussed this issue with several administrators and they all state they know what makes an effective DPO and that the positive regard for others is a primary element. However, too often we hire individuals who bring a perpetual negative response to persons who commit crime. These individuals often have the attitude that criminals "never change." With this attitude one wonders why they became DPOs.	DPO issues	No response necessary.
Bob Franklin Executive Director	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)			There are several references to the demeanor of the probation officer having real impact on the response exhibited by the probationer. The background and personality of the person selected to become a DPO is a vital concern. It has been stated that the most important element in a positive/productive life was the unconditioned love and support provided by one meaningful relationship. Is it too much to ask that the DPO have the ability and personal involvement to be that person?	DPO issues	No response necessary.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Bob Franklin Executive Director	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)			As more counties eliminate the baccalaureate degree as a requirement for the position of DPO, the level of negative regard, disbelief in positive change and a more law enforcement mentality will become more entrenched.	DPO issues	Phase II.
Bob Franklin Executive Director	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)			Is it possible that the move away from a liberal arts background toward a criminal justice degree has perpetuated this selection process and the move toward a more law enforcement attitude rather than one of helping the individual make positive choices and efforts to change?	DPO issues	No response necessary.
	San Luis Obispo County Probation	X	Agree	It is important to point out that in our county, state parole officers make about \$20,000 more per year than our probation officers. The average patrol deputy sheriff makes at least \$6.00 an hour more than probation; even the correction officers at the jail make more than we do. And we are required to have a college education and address the issues surrounding the 100% criminal population we are asked to supervise. Our juvenile custodial officers often need two jobs, and some have to live in subsidized housing because their salaries are extremely low. Our benefit package suffers the same. It's no wonder why probation has such a hard time recruiting and retaining quality officers. When you get at the facts, it is no wonder we lose good officers to other agencies including local law enforcement. In the last 5 years, we have lost several well-trained and productive probation officers to local law enforcement. Why? Salaries, benefits, and politics.	DPO issues	Phase II.
	San Luis Obispo County Probation	X	Agree	The probationers that were interviewed brought up some interesting points. Treating people with respect is a training issue. Ignoring complaints is a department issue. One must bear in mind when evaluating these statements that we as probation officers put up with a lot of verbal abuse. We have had our families threatened, and ourselves. We've been called every name in the book, and more than one of us has been injured on duty, either in a custody setting or in field work. People need to understand that being a probation officer has an element of risk involved. Because of our years of experience we've seen the changing face of the probationer. The statistics you cite support that.	DPO issues	No response necessary.
Michael F. Brown County Administrator	County of Santa Barbara Administrator's Office		Do not agree	Although some recommendations are good, the report does not contain a plan for how they would be implemented or funded. Thus, the stipulated target audience (Judicial Council, Legislature, Governor, etc.) would not know what to do. Accordingly, the report is incomplete staff work as the practicality of the recommendations cannot be assessed. Its findings are likely to die in a select Legislative Study committee. Basic state-level fiscal policy is set by voter initiative—Prop 13, Measure 4, rob 67, Prop 218—which limits government expenditures. What about returning part of ERAF to this?	General	Phase II.
Sylvia J. Johnson Chief Probation Officer	Alameda County Probation Department		Agree	I appreciate the comprehensive and thorough review included in the report.	General	No response necessary.
John Cavalli Chief Probation Officer	Santa Clara County Probation Department		Agree	I appreciate all of the hard work that was done by the Probation Services Task Force.	General	No response necessary.
Stephen Heggen Supervising Probation Officer	El Dorado County Probation		Do not Agree	A tremendous amount of work has gone into preparing this report. My thanks to those taking a critical look at this important and vital part of the criminal justice system.	General	No response necessary.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Larry R. Price Chief Probation Officer	Fresno County Probation Department		Agree	I have read the 'Probation Services Task Force Interim Report' and wish to express my opinion that this is an exceptionally well-done document. The report accomplishes many objectives for the delivery of probation services in California. It brings to the forefront the importance of the role of probation in the California criminal justice system and provides a clear and concise understanding for the reader of what probation "really does." This document will serve as a milestone in California for future policy and funding decisions for delivery of probation services to the people of this great state. My thanks to the California Judicial Council and all of the members who have given of their time to serve on this task force.	General	No response necessary.
John M. Wardell Chief Probation Officer	Nevada County Probation Department		Agree only if modified	By in large the report is very well done.	General	No response necessary.
Doug Rublaitus Chief Probation Officer	Alpine County Probation		Agree	Excellent job!	General	No response necessary.
C. Brent Wallace County Administrator	County of Tuolumne Administrator's Office		Agree only if modified	I have read the 'Probation Services Task Force Interim Report' and commend each member for the work that has been accomplished.	General	No response necessary.
Bob Franklin Executive Director	State Coalition of Probation Organizations, SCOPO			I wish to congratulate the members of the council and all involved persons and contributors for the Herculean task that has been accomplished. I feel you have identified and clearly stated issues, concerns and recommendations that will be useful in improving and correcting many issues that confront probation today.	General	No response necessary.
Trish Clarke Chair	CSAC Administration of Justice Policy Committee	X		On behalf of the county representatives on the Probation Services Task Force, I want to commend you for your extraordinary commitment and tireless work on behalf of all task force members. We all remain resolute in our determination to find solutions that will enhance the probation system in California.	General	No response necessary.
Trish Clarke Chair	CSAC Administration of Justice Policy Committee	X		We are encouraged by the extraordinary efforts of the task force over the last year and a half. The interim report, which details the scope of the task force's examination and outreach efforts, is a consensus work product that reflects the points on which task force members could reach agreement. Perhaps one of its greatest values is that it serves to educate the public, policymakers, and all interested stakeholders about the unique and critical role of the probation system and the many fiscal and operational challenges it faces. While we have much work ahead of us in phase two of the task force, the clear and articulate account of the past, present, and future of probation provides a solid foundation upon which we can build.	General	No response necessary.
Phil Erdman President	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)		Agree only if modified	First of all, I want to congratulate those on the Probation Services Task Force on completing the extensive research shown by this report. It was a "breath of fresh air" that was needed at this very critical time in probation's history. At times, I have asked the question "Let's stop for a moment and find out just what are we really doing?" especially when I have witnessed many probation departments flip-flop in their direction and mission many times over the last three decades. I have enjoyed reading this draft interim report and look forward to the second study phase of the task force.	General	No response necessary.
Family & Juvenile Subcommittee	Judicial Council of California	X	Blank	We agree that this is an exceptionally well-crafted report that required substantial primary research. The "general profile" of probation was a unique contribution; this information has never before been compiled for the state. The report's appendices contain a large amount of supportive information. One reader didn't learn anything new from this report, while another added that a big contribution of the report is that it sets the stage for taking on the work that will need to be done.	General	No response necessary.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report* **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Dave Rosenberg Chairman	Yolo County Board of Supervisors	X	Agree	We commend the task force on the thoroughness of their approach and success in identifying the issues with which we deal on a daily basis. An accurate description of the current state of probation has been developed, hopefully leading toward an effective model that can be adopted.	General	No response necessary.
Bart Bohn County Administrative Officer	Fresno County Administrator's Office		Blank	Staff has carefully reviewed the Probation Services Task Force Interim Report made public in January 2002. The task force deserves to be complimented for the in-depth evaluation and study of the role probation has in county and state government. The document does a good job of explaining the differences throughout the state and nation regarding probation services and responsibilities. I support the uniformed approach to the operation of probation services throughout the state suggested in the Interim Report and look forward to the subsequent report.	General	No response necessary.
Cliff Merrill Acting Chief Probation Officer	Solano County Probation		Agree	Excellent work!	General	No response necessary.
Thomas Folena Editor in Chief	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)		Agree only if modified	In response to your Interim Report, I was very impressed with the work that has been done so far. I believe your report and recommendations, for the most part, address the most important areas in probation that need change.	General	No response necessary.
James Rowland Chief Probation Officer	Napa County Probation Department	X	Agree	We have reviewed with interest the recommendations in the Probation Services Task Force Interim Report and would like to commend the task force on its thorough, well-thought-out, and well-written work. We are pleased to say we are not only in substantial agreement, we are already moving in many of the directions indicated.	General	No response necessary.
James Rowland Chief Probation Officer	Napa County Probation Department	X	Agree	We support the efforts of the task force and are pleased with the results so far. Thank you for the hard work and thoughtfulness given to this work, and for the opportunity to add our comments.	General	No response necessary.
J. Steven Worthley Chairman	Tulare County Board of Supervisors	X	Blank	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Probation Services Task Force Interim Report. The amount of care and thought that went in to the report is evident.	General	No response necessary.
Richmond, Harlan, Vinson, Krietich	Amador County Superior Court, Board of Supervisors, and Probation Department	X	Blank	Amador County appreciates the time and effort the task force members, staff, liaisons and consultants spent on this project. We also appreciate the comments of the probationers who were included in the project.	General	No response necessary.
Stephen Birdlebough	Friends Committee on Legislation of California		Blank	As a lawyer who appreciates the role of probation services, let me commend the Judicial Council Task Force's efforts reflected in the above report. Improving the services of 58 probation departments in a state as diverse as California is a huge undertaking, and the task force seems to have achieved some hard-won success in its first phases. However, I would like to challenge the Judicial Council to more move directly to the heart of the issues.	General	No response necessary.
	San Luis Obispo County Probation	X	Agree	Please allow us a moment to thank the members of the Probation Services Task Force, and their support staff for compiling such a comprehensive report regarding the status of probation, the deputies and custodial officers working in the state of California. It is a pleasure to see that others are as concerned over the probation system as the officers who work within it are. We are responding, with comments, as experienced line officers with over 15 years experience each.	General	No response necessary.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
	San Luis Obispo County Probation	X	Agree	Public safety is our number one goal. We live in our communities and wish to continue our part in the criminal justice system. We thank you again for the effort put forth in this report, and hope that your recommendations, and those of the deputy probation officers around the state, will be heeded.	General	No response necessary.
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	I have reviewed the Interim Report of the Probation Services Task Force and find it very thorough and intriguing. The task force has done an excellent presentation of the issues in governance and service delivery currently facing probation departments. I could do very little, if anything, to improve on or detract from this report. In reading it, it must be recognized that it is only the first part of an extensive study of the relationship between the judicial and executive branches of local government, and their responsibilities to provide services to the community through the probation officer and his department.	General	No response necessary.
Penelope Clarke Administrator	County of Sacramento Public Protection Agency	X	Blank	Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments to the draft Interim Report of the Probation Services Task Force. The report is comprehensive and reflects a thorough understanding of the many issues surrounding the provision of probation services.	General	No response necessary.
Mari Beraz County Administrative Officer	Monterey County Administrator's Office	X	Blank	The Board of Supervisors expresses Monterey County's support for the second phase of the task force efforts. The Monterey County Board of Supervisors extends its appreciation for the comprehensive analysis and recommendation process undertaken by the task force in its initial phase, and further thanks the task force members for a thorough analysis, presented in a well-written and organized interim report.	General	No response necessary.
Bob Franklin Executive Director	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)			It is obvious from the many comments from judges and probationers, that probation and most probation officers are held in high esteem. Is it possible that we have become our worst enemies by ignoring our own strengths and allowing budget issues to design departments and delivery of services contrary to our beliefs and the expressed needs of the community?	General	No response necessary.
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	I am very fortunate to be working with a supportive board of supervisors, county administrator and staff, and Judicial Council. There have been financial and budgeting issues that have required such support and, in general, we all have been working cooperatively and collaboratively to ensure timely and effective service delivery. But, as demonstrated in this task force report, that is not always the case of others, and may not be for us in the coming years of diminishing resources and budgetary crises.	General	No response necessary.
Bob Franklin Executive Director	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)			I find it discouraging that many of the issues addressed in the Governor's Blue Ribbon Commission study on the Criminal Justice System and the presentation by CPPCA, Corrections 2000, remain unchanged.	General	No response necessary. Task force will review.
Bekki Riggan Principal Management Analyst	County Executive Office		Agree	Placer County strongly encourages the continuation of this task force study with the hopes that it leads to identification of more effective funding and management models for California probation departments.	General	No response necessary.
Dave Rosenberg Chairman	Yolo County Board of Supervisors	X	Agree	We understand the need for a second study phase given the enormity of the task and appreciate the desire to publish a truly usable study. It is fortunate that the Judicial Council has realized the need to examine probation services and its central position in the local and state criminal justice structure. This is a step that could very well lead to improved efficacy of that system.	General	No response necessary.
J. Steven Worthley Chairman	Tulare County Board of Supervisors	X	Blank	Overall, we agree with the task force conclusion that more work is required and that the points outlined in the Interim Report shall serve as guidance for that additional work.	General	No response necessary.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	I have followed the progress of this report since the formation of the task force and have given the task force my own input. I do not always agree on all issues with my fellow chief probation officers, some who have problems unique to their larger jurisdictions and who tend to sway the smaller counties into following their lead. However, the process used to gather information for this report included input from the smaller northern counties and stakeholders, and constitutes what I believe to be an accurate picture of the issues.	General	No response necessary.
C. Brent Wallace County Administrator	County of Tuolumne Administrator's Office		Agree only if modified	The Interim Report recommendations include, in several recommendations, the word "should." This may be a result of the background of the various individuals involved with the task force and a hesitancy to include stronger language that could be imposed upon a probation department. Almost all of these recommendations could be revised and applied to any function of local government, which does not invalidate the recommendation, but it seems reasonable that some of these recommendations are deserving of stronger language that would be supported by a majority of the committee members.	General	Phase II.
Thomas Folena Editor in Chief	State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO)		Agree only if modified	Concerning your 18 recommendations, I highly agree with 15 of your recommendations, Obviously implementation of these changes will necessitate strong lobbying in Sacramento, to ensure enactment of new laws that will mandate specific changes. There are only 3 recommendations that I disagree with, probably because I am unclear as to what the probation officer's actual responsibility will be.	General	No response necessary.
Richmond, Harlan, Vinson, Kriletich	Amador County Superior Court, Board of Supervisors, and Probation Department	X	Blank	The 18 recommendations appear to be well thought out and appropriate. There are a few points which need further clarification and study before statewide policies are made.	General	No response necessary.
Richmond, Harlan, Vinson, Kriletich	Amador County Superior Court, Board of Supervisors, and Probation Department	X	Blank	Amador County is supportive of the efforts of the Probation Services Task Force. Except for recommendation 18, Amador County agrees in principle to the other 17 recommendations. We also agree to the areas of funding, appointment and evaluation of the chief probation officer, and responsibility of detention facilities require further in-depth investigation and recommendations.	General	No response necessary.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	In general, I disagree with assumptions and recommendations as they pertain to the "Charge" of the Probation Services Task Force. For complete comments, see tab 41.	General	No response necessary.
Penelope Clarke Administrator	County of Sacramento Public Protection Agency	X	Blank	Most of the report recommendations make sense and are beneficial in the provision of services. Stable funding, mission statements, goals, measurable outcomes, a common statewide language, collaborative relationships between courts, counties and educational agencies are important requirements for administering probation services. The recommendations for assessment and classification systems, graduated continuum of services and sanctions, early interventions, identification of educational needs, reforms aimed at ensuring juveniles are appropriately detained and balanced accountability are important in ensuring that juvenile and adults are provided needed services while the community needs are met.	General	No response necessary.
Penelope Clarke Administrator	County of Sacramento Public Protection Agency	X	Blank	Sacramento County comments are limited to a discussion of the California Probation Model, development of workload standards and technology resources.	General	No response necessary.
Alice Vilardi Judge	Superior Court of California, County of Alameda		Agree only if modified	A footnote to the first sentence of the General Profile section explaining the difference between probation and parole would be informative.	General	Agree. The appropriate footnote will be added to report.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Alice Vilardi Judge	Superior Court of California, County of Alameda		Agree only if modified	p. 3: There may be an inconsistency between, or an error in one, of the following two sentences that appear on this page. "From 1990 to 1999, adult probation populations increased steeply, with the adult probation population growing by 41.3 percent" is the first sentence. The second, in the next section of the report, reads "California experienced a significant change in the probation population during the years 1991 to 1999, with the total adult population increasing approximately 7 percent." Should the second sentence say "adult probation population increasing approximately 7 percent"? And if so, a comment explaining the difference between the national trend and that in California would be informative.	General	Agree. Will revise for clarity.
Alice Vilardi Judge	Superior Court of California, County of Alameda		Agree only if modified	p.3 There is a nonsequitur in the second and third sentences of the discussion headed California's Probation Population. While it may be true that California's probation population has become markedly more violent, that fact is not established by noting the number of adult probationers sentenced for a felony offense, as a large number of felonies do not involve acts of violence. A dramatic increase in the prosecution of nonviolent drug charges, and commitment to probation for supervision of drug treatment, for instance, could account for much of the increase in felons on probation. (And would explain why it is true, as is noted later in the draft, that adult drug courts are evolving into a core service of adult supervision [p. 48].)	General	Agree. Will revise for clarity.
Wendy Watanabe Assistant Division Chief	Los Angeles County Chief Administrator's Office		Agree	We welcome and look forward to the task force's second phase of continued study in the development of a comprehensive, long-term plan related to the funding and delivery of probation services and other aspects.	General	No response necessary.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	The 5 Fundamental Principles violate the intent of the "Charge." In using business concepts, I have argued that the PSTF has not approached its "Charge." The recommendations made by the PSTF consist mostly of services the probation department should provide, and how it should be managed. The "Charge" did not ask for this. The "Charge" asked for what was being offered, not what should be. Only the first two recommendations address the "Charge," but they have been limited in the exploration of possibilities as a result of Principles 2 and 3.	Principles	Disagree.
	San Luis Obispo County Probation	X	Agree	An issue we did not see mentioned was courtesy supervision. This whole section of the system is a mess. Interstate compact is not much better. In regards to courtesy supervision, we know that the restrictions placed is solely a result of under staffing in outside county agencies. We can only assume the lengthy delays in interstate compact is because of the same. It appears to be well known in the land of the convicted felon that if you move, you probably won't be supervised. That doesn't do much to support our goal of public safety.	Probation	Agree. Will include courtesy supervision in "Probation Present."
Kimberly Barrett Chief Probation Officer	San Luis Obispo Probation Dept.		Agree	Probation officers have dual roles which are integrated daily into the job. We should not continue to try to label officers solely in one role or the other.	Probation	No response necessary. Probation Services Task Force acknowledges role of probation in "Probation Future."
Bruce West Deputy Probation Officer	San Luis Obispo County Probation Department		Blank	While identifying the "unique and central position" of probation in the justice system, the draft report at one point refers to the existing "dual role" of probation. From my perspective and experience (30 years) this perception, although generally accepted, cripples our ability to meet the potential inherent in that "unique and central position". It also maintains a state of chronic divisiveness and prohibits us from moving forward professionally. The reality is that a central vision, purpose, and goal are basic requirements for organizational survival and success.	Probation	No response necessary. Probation Services Task Force acknowledges role of probation in "Probation Future."
	San Luis Obispo County Probation	X	Agree	One of the most important issues pointed out is the dual roles of probation officers. These roles can be integrated, and many officers effectively do so. However, labeling of officers in one role or another is detrimental to the overall health and well being of the local jurisdiction and the system as a whole. One judge's comment about how probation seems to be hiring more people with criminal justice degrees instead of liberal arts degrees supports this concern. It would seem to us that the sheer number of adult felons, under probation supervision, would support that professionals with degrees in criminal justice may well be better suited to the role of a deputy probation officer. Many criminal justice majors complete internships, while in college, with criminal justice agencies. Therefore, these individuals have at least a working knowledge of the criminal mind, have dealt with volatile issues first hand, or have basic knowledge of the Penal Code, Welfare and Institutions code, Health and Safety code, and so forth.	Probation	No response necessary. Probation Services Task Force acknowledges role of probation in "Probation Future."

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
John M. Wardell Chief Probation Officer	Nevada County Probation Department		Agree only if modified	A larger sampling of counties is needed to represent a total understanding of large-, medium- and small-county needs and issues.	Probation	Disagree. The task force includes representatives from rural, suburban, and urban counties in northern, central, and southern California. The six counties selected to participate in the snapshot study were selected as representative diverse counties; further, the survey was sent to relevant stakeholders in all counties, and the roundtables reached out to participants from urban, suburban, and rural counties.
Robert G. McAlister Chief Probation Officer	Mendocino County Probation Department		Blank	<p>It is often difficult to look at what is working and what is not in Mendocino County, when being compared to counties where funding for programs is proportionate to size, and where small programs become benchmarks for programs desired by our local judiciary, without consideration for funding sources. For instance, a successful truancy reduction program in Fresno County may rely on having several deputy probation officers on campus at one school the same size as one of our own, but our staff allocation does not allow for placing more than one officer on several campuses during any given time period. It sometimes comes down to picking and choosing which programs to implement that will provide the best public safety and client service, rather than having many programs that will fail due to overextension of staff and resources. The problem arises for many of us chiefs when a judge decides that that truancy program is effective and must be implemented immediately in this jurisdiction. When informed that this takes funding, the response is to ask the board of supervisors for the money, but get the program implemented now.</p> <p>This leads to the primary issue of governance and how it affects the ability of the probation officer to implement and sustain court-ordered services while maintaining a budget involving general funds, grants and government allocations, all under the control and direction of the county. Judiciary and executive mandates sometimes conflict and leave the probation officer feeling frustrated and lacking support from either branch.</p>	Probation	Agree. Will revise text to reflect local differences.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	If the PSTF is to be successful, it must get to the basics: (1) What are probation's essential functions, as described by law, including dependency? (2) What should be done by probation that cannot be done by anyone else? Or what can probation do better than someone else, because of its mandatory functions? (3) What functions are being done by probation, that they should not be doing? (4) What does the future have in hold for these functions? (5) With this information, write a mission statement for probation (6) Now that probation has its mission, how (goals and objectives) do we make it happen (strategic plan)? (7) With the goals and objectives, what kind of management structure will be best to implement them?. In doing these steps, the "Charge" will be accomplished. For complete comments, see tab 41.	Probation Services Task Force	No response necessary.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	Based upon what appears the general intent of the "charge," it seems the five fundamental principles of the PSTF have narrowed the charge in a way that suppresses free analysis. If the five fundamental principles are not broadened, it is suggested the task force will fail to consider options that will benefit its effort. For complete comments, see tab 41.	Probation Services Task Force	Disagree.
Ray W. Miller Probation Officer II	San Bernardino County Probation		Do not agree	In the first phase of the task force effort, the PSTF has gathered information that analyzes the environment. The PSTF analysis of the data is, in my opinion, not true to the "charge." For complete comments, see tab 41.	Probation Services Task Force	Disagree.

## *Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report*

### **Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Thomas M. Anderson Public Defender	Nevada County Public Defender			The Task Force membership does not include anyone from the criminal defense bar. The role of probation, while critical to the success of the criminal justice system, shares that role with prosecution, bench and defense. It is the defendant and defense attorney that are directly impacted by the efforts or lack of effort by a probation officer or probation department. It is the defendant and defense attorney that are critical partners to a P.O., if that P.O. is to be successful in a specific case. Additionally, the philosophy of what probation should do and how to approach their role is not addressed. That element is critical to the success of probation officers on a case-by-case basis. Uniform understanding of the hands-on role of a P.O. is something that is clearly lacking across the board. That issue is not a performance measure but an identity issue that permeates all that P.O.s do.	Probation Services Task Force	Disagree. The composition of the task force was set to allow representation by the core stakeholders while keeping the group at an appropriate number given the short time span necessary to complete the broad charge. The task force considered inviting other stakeholders, including defense attorneys, to participate in the task force. After lengthy discussion, the task force determined that the best method for completing the charge while receiving stakeholder input was to keep the established task force composition but to conduct extensive outreach, including (1) holding public meetings and hosting a public Web site, (2) surveying interested parties, (3) holding roundtable discussions.
Bart Bohn County Administrative Officer	Fresno County Administrator's Office		Blank	I understand our Probation Services Manager, Philip Kader, has been a member of your task force since it began over fifteen months ago. I am pleased that a Fresno representative will remain on the task force to work on your continued effort to submit a final report.	Probation Services Task Force	No response necessary.
J. Warchol Chief Probation Officer	El Dorado County Probation		Blank	The use of placement, and placements themselves, should be reviewed. This is an area that requires major reform.	Services	Phase II.
	San Luis Obispo County Probation	X	Agree	Probation has always been the hidden component of their system. Until recently, probation has not even had a strong presence in Sacramento (i.e., legislative support, lobbying, etc.) And often our needs were ignored because probation has never been a "squeaky wheel."	Status of probation	Phase II.
Martin Staven Presiding Judge of the Juvenile Court	Superior Court of California, County of Tulare		Agree	Blank.		No response necessary.

***Probation Services Task Force Draft Interim Report***  
**Comment Chart**

Full Name	Organization	On Behalf of a Group	Check Box	Comment	Theme / Topic	Agree/Disagree/ No Response Necessary / Phase II Issue
Patrick Casey Senior Analyst	County of Imperial, County Executive Office		Agree	Blank.		No response necessary.